

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THOSE who know anything about the game of golf know something about Mr. Horace G. HUTCHINSON. To them it may be a surprise to learn that Mr. HUTCHINSON has until recently been a religious agnostic. It will certainly be a surprise to them to know that he is now a believing and rejoicing Christian. How he passed *From Doubt to Faith* he tells us in a small book with that title which has just been published (Longmans; rs. 6d. net).

He was an agnostic because he could not believe in the Divinity of Christ. He was able to believe that Christ might possess 'something of the divine creating spirit.' So might any man. He was willing to grant that He might possess a larger share of that spirit than any other man, and so be, in that limited sense, more divine than any other person of whom we have record in history. But he knew that that is not what is meant by the Divinity of Christ. He knew that in admitting so much as that he had gone no way at all towards acceptance of 'the claim of Christianity for the nature of its Founder.' Believing all that he could believe, he knew that he did not believe that Christ was more than 'a mere man.'

The Divinity of Christ is 'the one great primary and crucial difficulty of the agnostic.' He may believe this or disbelieve that other item of the

Christian creed, but he knows that this is the only belief or disbelief that matters. This is the cardinal or 'hinge' belief. If he can believe the Divinity of Christ, the door is open to the fullest acceptance of Christianity. He has but to go forward. If he cannot believe it he has not crossed the Christian threshold.

Why could not Mr. HUTCHINSON believe the Divinity of Christ? Because it is a miracle. What is a miracle? It is 'an interference with, an interruption of, the ordinary course of Nature.' Does he mean, then, that such interruption or interference is impossible? 'No man who was not an absolute fool' would say so. If God can create at all, if He can set the machinery of the Universe in motion, He can, if it seem good to Him at any time, 'alter a screw here and there in the mechanism,' which is to Mr. HUTCHINSON the same thing as interrupting the action of the laws of Nature, or performing a miracle. But *He has never done so*. That is the difficulty. He has not interfered. 'We have, at least, no certain warrant, outside revealed religion, for saying that He has at any point or at any moment interfered with the mechanism, by the readjustment of a screw or by alteration of the smallest detail, since first He set the great complexity in movement.'

At any point, or at any moment? Mr.

HUTCHINSON returns upon these words. Are there no moments in the history of the Universe at which a readjustment or interference has taken place? There are said to be two such moments. The one is the introduction of life. The other is the beginning of self-conscious reason in man.

But we are not sure of either point. The authorities are divided. Biologists, who are the experts on the one point, and the composite committee of biologists and psychologists, who are the experts on the other, have come to no agreement. And until they agree, or at least approach more nearly to an agreement, it is not competent for us to use these moments as proof that interference has taken place in the orderly evolution of the Universe.

We are thrown back on the historical evidence. If the evidence for the incarnation of the Son of God is so good as to outweigh the improbability of such a miracle occurring, then we may and must believe it. But in order to convince the agnostic that such a miracle had occurred, 'an immense cloud of witness would be needed. The testimony would require to be most emphatic and most clear. And it did not seem as if testimony of sufficient strength could possibly be produced.'

At this stage the obvious thing to do was to examine the evidence. Mr. HUTCHINSON did not do that. Does any agnostic do it? We have read the writings of agnostics not a few, and we have been astonished at their ignorance of the evidence and of the literature in which it is set forth. Mr. HUTCHINSON did not examine the evidence. But he was aware of the disadvantage of agnosticism. He saw that if he could believe in the Divinity of Christ he would certainly be a happier and might possibly be a better man. So, though he did not at once examine the evidence for this great miracle, he set about considering if in the nature of things there were any probabilities for or against it.

He found one probability, and it strongly im-

pressed him. Supposing that the Creator set going the whole scheme of evolution as science tells us that He did, and supposing that the scheme included the evolution, in process of time, of a being endowed with reason and free will, so as to be able to follow one or another line of conduct at his choice; supposing, further, that the Creator, looking down upon this being whom He had evolved, perceived him misusing his gifts, acting wrongly, foolishly, in a way which did not accord with His great design—what, in that case, may we deem it likely that the Creator would do?

He might do one of two things. He might at once stop the machinery, or He might determine to put Himself into communication with man in order to point out to him how he had gone astray and if possible bring him back to the right way. If He adopted the first plan it would be a confession of failure. It seems most likely that He would adopt the second.

But how is God going to communicate with man? He would certainly do it in the simplest and most natural way. He would do it in such a way as to cause the least apparent interruption of that evolutionary scheme which He had set going in the indefinitely remote past. Does it not, even to our limited human intelligence, seem manifest that the simplest way would be to 'give to some creature, who in all outward aspect should be very man, a portion of His own divinity—a portion of His own divine wisdom and divine goodness'?

This is the probability that occurred to Mr. HUTCHINSON and impressed him. It impressed him sufficiently to induce him to turn again to the evidence. Now before this probability occurred to him the testimony for the Divinity of Christ did not appear to him to be sufficient to carry conviction. 'But when I came,' he says, 'to examine that testimony from rather a different point of view, after I had been led to see the reasonableness of supposing that the Creator might converse

with and give guidance to His creatures in just that way which the Christian creed would have us conceive, then it is likely enough that I began to consider the testimony with a greater sympathy.' In any case he regarded it with closer attention. And what did he find? 'The effect of the new examination was to reveal the fact, which I had not realized before, that the testimony, pointing in its totality to the conclusion that Jesus Christ was something very much more than mere man, really is immense, and very remarkable alike in its quantity, its kind, and its variety.' In short, it seemed to him now that the simplest way of accounting for the mass of evidence in favour of the Incarnation was to believe in the fact of it.

It was an intellectual conviction, but it brought peace, and he believes that it will bring progress. The things of this world now fall for him into quite a different perspective. He regards the death of the body, which from the agnostic's point of view appears the possible end and annihilation of his consciousness, as nothing more than a new and most thrilling adventure in the life of the soul. He looks forward with eager interest and hope to that which is beyond, confident that within an infinitesimal space of time after his mortal death his soul will be energizing, perhaps with immensely increased vigour, in a different environment, endowed with different and far higher capacities for the achievement of its new aims.

Professor H. R. MACKINTOSH has written a book on the Christian Doctrine of Eternal Life, giving it the title of *Immortality and the Future* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). It is a difficult subject. It has always been difficult. But for a special reason its difficulty is greater now than it has ever been.

For now its discussion involves the doctrine of the Person of Christ. The most momentous words about the Last Things were spoken by our Lord, and they seem to contradict one another.

We have been told that the contradiction is due to His reporters, but that explanation has not been found satisfactory. It has not fitted all the facts. At one time our Lord seems to expect the end of the world immediately, even within His own generation; at another He seems to look forward to a long period of progress or decay before the end comes. To cut away one series of prophecies and attribute them to His reporters has been found to be impracticable. The apparent contradiction remains. And as soon as we try to explain it we are up against the extreme difficulty of His Person.

Professor MACKINTOSH accepts the contradiction. Certain texts, he says, appear to indicate an intense belief on Jesus' part that the Parousia would arrive speedily. The language of Mt 16²⁸ is unambiguous: 'There be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.' And in Mk 13³⁰, after an enumeration of signs presaging the Return, it is said: 'This generation shall not pass away, until all these things be accomplished.' That is the one side.

On the other side there are indications in the parables—slight indications, Dr. MACKINTOSH calls them—that the interval might be a long one. He gives two examples. The first is Lk 12⁴⁵: 'If that servant shall say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming'; with which he compares Mt 25¹⁹: 'Now after a long time the lord of those servants cometh.' The other example is Mk 4²⁶⁻²⁹, where, in the Parable of the Seed, the End seems to be postponed to a quite indefinite distance. He also quotes the phrase employed by Jesus in His eulogy of the woman who anointed Him: 'Whosoever the gospel shall be preached in the whole world'—a phrase which he thinks (if it is part of the original tradition) must be reckoned as proof that in His view the interval preceding the Return would be protracted.

Professor MACKINTOSH's solution of the diffi-

culty is simple. He believes that Jesus' thought of the Parousia 'varied in different moods. At one time He looks for it immediately, at another He beholds it far away, at a third He distinctly disclaims all knowledge of its day or hour (Mk 13³²).'

'Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith' (2 Co 13⁵). There was a time in Scotland—it is within the memory of less than 'the oldest inhabitant'—when this text was frequently preached from. It was the text, beyond all other texts, which was used for the 'Fencing of the Tables.'

It is not much used now, because the Tables are not now fenced. If they were fenced still, this text would still be used. For there is no other that fits the occasion. In all the New Testament—and no one would go to the Old Testament for the Fencing of the Tables—there is only one other text which encourages to self-examination. It may have been the discovery of that fact, leading to a consideration of the value of a duty which had so little encouragement in the New Testament, that served in some degree to the disuse of the Fencing of the Tables. And there may have been other reasons. But so it is. This and the text in First Corinthians which is called in Presbyterian Churches the 'Warrant,' are the only two passages in all the New Testament which recommend self-examination.

And both passages recommend self-examination for a special purpose. We know what the 'Warrant' recommends it for. Here also the purpose is put very pointedly: 'Examine yourselves, *whether ye be in the faith.*' The occasion was as pointed as the injunction. There were those who denied the apostleship of St. Paul. They came as far as to Corinth denying it. And they persuaded some of the Christian Corinthians. St. Paul had to defend himself. He claimed to be an apostle. It is true he was not one of the original Twelve. But then an apostle is not known by a number, like a private soldier. An apostle is known by his works.

The works of an apostle are the bringing of men and women to Christ. St. Paul has been at Corinth. Has he brought any to Christ there? He puts the question to the Corinthians themselves. Have they or have they not been brought to Christ? If they have not, he is not an apostle. If they have, he is. 'Examine yourselves,' he says, 'whether ye be in the faith.'

Now, how are we to examine ourselves, whether we be in the faith? What is the test? Here the apostle says that, if we be in the faith, Jesus Christ will be in us, and that we shall know it. 'Know ye not,' he goes on to say, 'that Jesus Christ is in you?' But however easy to the Corinthians, that is a little difficult for us. It will be easier if we go back a little and see how Christ comes to be in us. Let us, in other words, ask the question first of all how one becomes a Christian. When we understand that, we may be able to tell whether Christ is in us or not.

The best account of how one becomes a Christian is to be found in St. Paul's own words: 'For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith working through love' (Gal 5⁶). This is at once the clearest and most complete account of the way to become a Christian which he gives in all his Epistles. How does a man become a Christian? By exercising faith. If the faith is genuine it will work through love. That is to say, it will enable a man to love God with all his heart and his neighbour as himself, which is the sum of the commandments. And if a man keeps the commandments in the sum of them, he has fellowship with God, or in other words, Christ is in him. The only necessary thing therefore to the making of a Christian is the exercise of faith.

Faith needs a little knowledge. It does not need much, but it needs a little. It needs the knowledge first that Christ lived and died, and next that He rose from the dead and is alive now. It needs the knowledge that He lived and died for

the forgiveness of sin, and that He rose and lives now for the deliverance from sin. That is all. On that knowledge faith works. And how does it work? It appropriates those two facts to a man's personal use. It makes those two facts his. He says that Christ lived and died for *his* sins, and that He rose and lives for *his* sanctification. When a man makes that appropriation he is a Christian.

Now this is very elementary doctrine. Why should it be repeated here? In order that, at such a time as this, we may examine ourselves whether we be in the faith. Why were we not able to prevent this war? Some say because we have not made enough progress in our Christian life. More likely it is because we have not begun it. Examine yourselves, says St. Paul, not as to the extent in which faith is working through love, but whether ye be in the faith.

Certainly we have faith in God. But St. Paul did not tell the Corinthians to examine themselves whether they had faith in God. They might be Jews or they might be Gentiles, in either case they had faith in God before he came to them. What he called them to was faith in Christ.

Have we faith in Christ? We have faith in Christ as a fact of history. We have faith in Christ as an ethical example. We have faith in Christ as a revelation of the Father. St. Paul thought of none of these things when he asked the Corinthians to examine themselves. Let us understand clearly that St. Paul was much less interested in the revealing Christ than we are. His interest was in the redeeming Christ. Have we faith in the Christ who gave Himself a ransom?

If we have not, we are not Christians. It is true that Christ gave Himself a ransom to bring us to God. If, therefore, we are at one with God, if we have entered into fellowship with Him, all is well. But have we? We believe in the Fatherhood, and we got that through Christ. Well, the Fatherhood

may be the highest revelation of God. But the revelation of the Fatherhood will carry us only a little way. It *has* carried us only a little way. It has made us abhor 'the bloody and deceitful man,' but it has not given us power to prevent the European war. Why have we not been able to prevent the European war? Because so many of us have been theists, and so few of us Christians.

Theism is good. It is belief in a true God. It is better than atheism, which has no God to believe in. It is better than deism, which believes only in a God who takes no interest in us. But it is helpless in the present and it is hopeless for the future. God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself—that is the God to believe in. And when we appropriate the reconciliation, by faith in Him who lived and died and rose again and lives now, we reach a God of power, a God of the power of love. Faith works through love, not our love to God only, but also God's love to us. And that love has power to prevent war. We know what Christ would have. He would have us love our enemies. And we know that, when by faith in the redeeming Christ we reach God, love lays hold of the power of God, and we are able to love our enemies.

Many years ago there was a cry raised, 'Back to Christ.' What did it mean? It meant back from Paulinism. It came to nothing. Let the cry again be 'Back to Christ,' but let it mean back from theism. We have been persuaded that it is not necessary to be Christians, if we are theists. The uninstructed mystic is partly to blame for it. We have been persuaded by our interest in mysticism to believe that a man may leave Christ out of account and yet come to God. But we have been much more generally persuaded by sentimentalism. Every ardent adjective has been used to describe the beautiful life of Jesus and the wonder of His revelation of God as Father. But it is only when admiration is lost in adoration that the Jesus of the Gospels becomes the power of God to the staying of war.

Christian Agnosticism.

BY THE REV. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D., FORMERLY MASTER OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, DURHAM.

THE title of this paper might possibly be understood in a sense the very opposite of that which is intended. It might by some be understood to mean the agnosticism which a loyal Christian ought to *avoid*; the agnosticism which proposes to make the central verities of the Christian faith an open question and plays fast and loose with such fundamental facts as the Personality of God, the Incarnation, the Divine Sonship of Jesus Christ, and the reality of the Atonement. Whether such an attitude of mind could rightly be called 'Christian Agnosticism' may be doubted: that is not its meaning in the subject before us. What is meant is that measure of agnosticism which a thoughtful and prudent Christian ought to *cultivate*; the agnosticism which shrinks from dogmatizing respecting matters that have not been revealed, and which, while it may claim the right to form opinions about such things, carefully remembers that they are only opinions, and therefore shrinks from condemning those who are unable to accept them. However convinced an individual may be that his own view of these questions is the true one, and that he is bound to give it his support, he has to consider that this does not justify him in proclaiming it as 'catholic,' or in attempting to brand as heretics those who question or deny it. Even if he is much nearer to the truth than they are, the fact remains that many things are true which are not articles of faith, and that therefore Christians are not disloyal in refusing to believe them.

It will help to put us in the right train of thought for considering this subject if we take a quotation from three writers who may be regarded as philosophical leaders in Greek, Latin, and English theology respectively, and who cannot be suspected of having any prejudice against dogmatic statements as such.

We begin with one who is esteemed as one of the main pillars of dogmatic theology, Athanasius. He points out the direction in which the line which divides what is certain by revelation from what is problematical and disputable lies. God has revealed certain *facts* about Himself and His Son and His Spirit, and about His relation to His

creatures. These things are true, and we have the right to say that we know that they are true. He has seldom revealed to us the *way* in which they come to be true; and where He has not done so, it is presumptuous to profess that we have knowledge. Indeed, Athanasius goes so far as to deprecate inquiry as to the 'Why' and the 'How' of what has been revealed. Οὐ δὲ ζητεῖν, Διὰ τί; οὐδὲ πρέπει ζητεῖν, Πῶς; Questioning of this kind savours of impiety; τὸ τοιοῦτο ἐρωτᾶν ἀσεβές ἐστι. But it will be well to have the whole passage; it is in the second Oration against the Arians, § 36.

'And we must not ask *why* the Word of God is not such as our word, seeing that God is not such as we are, as has been said before. But, moreover, it is not right to ask *how* the Word is from God, or *how* He is the effulgence of God, or *how* God begets, or what is the *manner* of His begetting. For a man must be beside himself to venture on such questions, because he claims to have explained in words a thing which is ineffable and a special property of God's nature, and which is known to Himself alone and to His Son. For it is all one as if such people asked, *where* God is, or *how* He exists, and of *what nature* is the Father. But as questioning of this kind savours of impiety and argues an ignorance of God, so there is also a want of reverence in venturing to raise such questions about the generation of the Son of God and in measuring God and His Wisdom by the standard of our own nature and feebleness.'

Let us now listen to a leader among the Latin Fathers.

It is a commonplace in the history of controversy that converts are commonly bitter critics of the system which they have abandoned. There are some notable exceptions to this generalization, and among them are Saint Augustine and Bishop Butler.

For nine years Augustine had been entangled in the doctrines of the Manichæans. At last he became convinced that their teaching was disastrously erroneous, and he left them. He endeavoured to convert them as they had converted him, and this is how he writes of them in

the second chapter of his Reply to the Fundamental Epistle of Manichæus :

‘Let those rage against you who know not what toil is needed to find the truth and how difficult it is to avoid errors ; who know not with how much difficulty the eye of the inner man is freed from disease ; who know not with what sighs and groans it is made possible, in however small a degree, to comprehend God. . . . Let neither of us assert that he has found the truth ; let us seek it as if it were unknown to both of us. For truth can be sought with zeal and unanimity only in the absence of any rash assumption that it has been already found.’

And now a few words from our own great theological teacher.

Bishop Butler, in his famous sermon on the Ignorance of Man, points out that, not only have many things not been revealed to us because we have not the faculties for comprehending them, but also many things have not been revealed which we could understand. He says :

‘As the works of God and His scheme of government are above our capacities thoroughly to comprehend, so there possibly may be reasons which originally made it fit that many things should be concealed from us which we have perhaps natural capacities for understanding ; many things concerning the designs, methods, and ends of Divine providence in the government of the world. There is no manner of absurdity in supposing a veil on purpose drawn over some scenes of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, the sight of which might some way or other strike us too strongly ; or that better ends are designed and served by their being concealed, than could be by their being exposed to our knowledge. . . . If to acquire knowledge were our proper end, we should indeed be but poorly provided : but if somewhat else be our business and duty, we may, notwithstanding our ignorance, be well enough furnished for it ; and the observation of our ignorance may be of assistance to us in the discharge of it.’

This brings us to the point which we are seeking. There are in the Christian religion cases in which it is good for us to observe our ignorance, and to confess our ignorance, and to remember that it is possible that the acquisition of certain knowledge would do us harm rather than good. To profess to have knowledge in such matters cannot be right.

It is remarkable, and to the last degree lament-

able, that two of the most momentous schisms which have rent the Church of Christ have been about questions respecting the ‘How’ of revealed facts. Immense bodies of Christians have cut themselves off from other large bodies of Christians by excommunication, because the two parties could not agree about the answer to a problem which it is impossible for the human intellect to solve with any certainty. The dispute in each case has continued for centuries, and the time when each side will recognize the only reasonable conclusion seems still to be very far off. It is improbable that in either case any revelation will be granted to decide the matter, and the existing evidence is insufficient. Yet each side is confident that its solution is the only true solution, and neither is willing that the question should be admitted to be an open one, about which every Christian ought to be allowed to believe as he thinks right. Still less, perhaps, is there any desire that each of us should reverently lay the question on one side, with the humble admission that he does not know and does not desire to know, for he is unable to see that the knowledge would help him to become a better Christian ; which may possibly be the reason why God has not revealed it.

Such seems to be the condition of things respecting the great controversy which for centuries has separated the Eastern Church from the Western ;—the controversy about the Procession of the Holy Spirit. Is it possible for any human being to know which of the two rival statements is nearer to the truth ? Whether, The Holy Spirit proceeds from all eternity from the Father alone, as the Orientals strenuously maintain ; or, The Holy Spirit proceeds from all eternity from the Father and the Son, as we and other Western Churches are in the habit of affirming.

It is possible that some of you have been accustomed to believe that the Eastern Church does not object to the *doctrine* of the Double Procession. What it so strenuously condemns is the irregular way in which the statement respecting the doctrine was inserted in the Creed. It rejects the *Filioque*, not as being untrue, but as having been put into one of the Church’s Creeds without the Church’s official sanction. That is what I was taught, and I believed it until the summer of 1874.

In 1874 and 1875 two memorable conferences were held at Bonn with a view to promote the reunion of Churches. They were initiated by Dr.

Döllinger, then under excommunication for rejecting the Infallibility of the Pope. He secured the attendance of representatives of the Greek, Russian, English, and American Episcopal Churches, and got leading Old Catholics to meet them, and he presided over all the sessions himself. One of the questions discussed was that of the Double Procession. Dr. Döllinger did me the honour of asking me to assist him and Bishop Reinkens in preparing material for some of the sessions of the Conference. He said that he was convinced that the common belief that the Orientals accepted the doctrine, while they resented the manner of its intrusion into the Creed, was erroneous; they rejected the doctrine: and the debate in the Conference showed that he was right. The Orientals, whether from Russia or Greece or elsewhere, absolutely refused to admit that there was any truth whatever in the statement that the Holy Spirit proceeded from all eternity from both the Father and the Son. The Father was the sole Fount of Divinity. Anglicans, Americans, and Old Catholics frankly admitted that the *Filioque* had been inserted in Western Creeds without proper authority. This did not at all satisfy the Orientals. They wanted the omission of the *Filioque* as untrue. They would not allow that there *is* any truth in the Western formula; and they rather unwillingly assented to an expression which could be understood as implying that there *may be* some truth in it. The Conference perhaps brought us a little nearer to the position that a question upon which the whole Church has never given a decision ought, even by the most rigid dogmatist, to be regarded as open, and that therefore neither side has a right to anathematize the other for the form of doctrine which it maintains. It is difficult to see how knowing which of the two formulas is more correct would help us to lead better lives; and therefore a reverent confession of agnosticism seems to be in place.

Another instance of the way in which attempts to determine the 'How' of a revealed fact has caused grievous schism in the Church is the bitter controversy which for centuries has raged round the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

There are few things more tragic in the history of Christ's Church than the fact that its central act of worship has for ages been, and still continues to be, a subject for the keenest contention, and that Christians have cruelly persecuted, and even put

to cruel deaths, other Christians, for not holding doctrines respecting the Lord's Supper which cannot be proved, and which possibly are not true. The Sacrament of Love and Life has been made an engine of hate and destruction, because men have insisted that they possessed knowledge which cannot be possessed, and upon explaining what cannot be explained.

We all of us are agreed as to the divine fact that in the Eucharist the faithful Christian receives the Body and Blood of Christ. To this doctrine Anglicans and Romanists, Lutherans and Calvinists, give ready assent. Difficulties, disputes, and dissensions begin when the question is raised, *How* is this divine result effected? It would be a painful, and perhaps not a very profitable, task to attempt to define accurately the various answers which have been given, and given with the utmost confidence, to this question, a question to which, without a special revelation, no certain answer can be given. The words of Scripture which bear on the question can be interpreted in more ways than one. The same may be said of the evidence of Church tradition. Human reason cannot settle it, for here the resources of philosophy and science are powerless. Nevertheless, there is nothing wrong—there may in some cases be real gain—in adopting one of the various theories respecting the manner of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist. If individuals find that their devotion to Christ and reverence for His Sacrament is promoted by one theory rather than another, ought any one to wish to deprive him of the liberty to believe it? By parity of reasoning, those who cherish a particular view ought to abstain from condemning those who in this matter differ from them. But perhaps those are wisest who do not even desire the knowledge of that which God has neither revealed nor enabled them to find out by means of the faculties with which He has endowed them, and are therefore content on this question also to profess a reverent agnosticism. In the first centuries Christians were content to use and enjoy this means of grace without attempting to define the manner of its operation. It would perhaps be our wisdom to do the same.

Before leaving the subject of the Eucharist it may be worth while to note a matter respecting which it is sometimes assumed that we possess knowledge, although it is difficult to believe that any one does possess it, namely, the manner and

moment of consecration. The *minister* in the Eucharist is not determined in Scripture any more than the minister in Baptism, and it is evident that in the *earliest* days of the Church of Corinth there were no appointed ministers. If there had been, St. Paul would have blamed them for tolerating the monstrous desecration of the Lord's Supper of which many communicants were guilty, and would have charged them to put a stop to it. On the other hand, it is evident that there and elsewhere a distinction between clergy and laity was made in the second half of the first century, and that in the first half of the second century the duty of presiding at the Eucharist was reserved to the clergy.

We are left in similar doubt as to the *words of consecration*. None of our four accounts of the Institution tells us what words our Lord used when He 'blessed' or 'gave thanks.' We infer from this that the exact words are not of supreme importance: it is having the mind of Christ and acting in His spirit that must be secured. Only the words which He used when He gave the bread and the cup to the disciples are recorded, and about these the four narratives differ surprisingly. The only words about which all four are agreed are 'This is my body,' and even in them there is a slight difference of order in the Greek. It is often supposed that these words are the words of consecration, and this view has prevailed in the Western Church. Our own Communion Service manifestly implies it. But even in the West eminent liturgiologists dissent from this view. It is manifest that these words, in all four of the narratives, are words of administration rather than of consecration; they follow the blessing. It is difficult to believe that the elements were not consecrated until Christ said, 'Take, eat, this is my body.' The consecration was effected when Christ gave thanks in words which have not been preserved. W. C. Bishop, a high authority, tells us that 'All liturgies of every type agree in bearing witness to the fact that the original form of consecration was a thanksgiving,' and that in the Eastern liturgies 'the words of institution were not recited as of themselves effecting the consecration, but rather as the authority in obedience to which the rite is performed' (*Ch. Quart. Rev.*, July 1908, pp. 387-392). In the main lines of Eucharistic teaching in the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries, as Dr. Darwell Stone points out, 'the moment of

consecration is associated with the invocation' (*Ch. Quart. Rev.*, Oct. 1908, p. 36). But here again there is some divergence; for some say that it is the invocation of God the Word, others the invocation of God the Holy Ghost, others again the invocation of the Holy Trinity, that is required. Cyril of Jerusalem gives both of the last two views. Origen says that the invocation of the Name of God and of Christ and of the Holy Spirit is the essential part of the consecration of the elements. In our own service there is no invocation.

The late Bishop Wordsworth, in one of his addresses to the clergy of the diocese of Salisbury, desired them not to crouch over the altar in reading the prayer of consecration. I do not remember his reasons. But besides the fact that the crouching attitude, as seen by the congregation, is not very dignified, there is the fact that any change of attitude seems to assume that we know two things, which are unknown, namely, the exact moment of consecration and the exact effect of consecration. All that it concerns us to know is that the elements, when they are administered to us, are duly consecrated, and that, if we receive them duly, we receive the Body and Blood of Christ.

If what has just been said is anywhere near the truth, it follows that we ought to cease to talk about 'invalid' sacraments. God alone knows whether any sacrament honestly administered with the intention of doing what Christ ordained, is ever 'invalid.' If we must criticize, it is safer to speak of what is 'irregular.' Every organized communion must lay down rules as to how sacraments are to be administered; for to leave everything to the discretion of the minister would be disastrous. These rules differ in different Churches, and what is 'regular' in one Church may be 'irregular' to members of another Church. But we know nothing about the 'invalidity' of an irregularly administered sacrament, and it is rash to assert that to those who receive it devoutly it is not a means of grace. It might not be such to us, if we, in a spirit of bravado, violated the rules of our own Church; but we know nothing of its effects on those who receive it in accordance with rules which they believe to be adequate. If that is true, it is well to profess agnosticism respecting it, and abstain from pronouncing any judgment as to its efficacy. See Thirlwall, *Charges*, i. pp. 245, 246, 278, ii. pp. 251, 281; Ellicott on 1 Co 11²⁴;

T. S. Evans in the *Speakers' Commentary* on 1 Co 10¹⁷; Hastings' *D.B.*, art. 'Lord's Supper'; Westcott, *Life and Letters*, to Archbp. of York, 8th October 1900.¹

Seeing that the essential articles of the Christian faith are few, and that the opinions which can be formed about details are almost limitless in number, it follows that the sphere in which Christian agnosticism can be exhibited is large. But I will mention only one more example. It is connected with a subject about which we have heard a great deal of late, namely, the miracles recorded in the New Testament.

It has been urged that we ought not to draw a strong line of distinction between the miracles of the New Testament and the miracles of the Old. Yet there is this intelligible and important difference between them. The evidence for the miracles in the New Testament is in most cases strong; in some cases it is stringent. This is by no means the case with regard to the miracles recorded in the O.T. The evidence for most of these, namely, those narrated in the Hexateuch, was written down several centuries after the time of the supposed events. Even the evidence for the miracles attributed to Elijah and Elisha was not written until a generation or more had passed away. But in Epistles of which no sane critic now doubts the authenticity we have St. Paul's own testimony as to miracles wrought by himself and others; and it is incredible that, unless he had wrought them, he would make such assertions to people who knew perfectly well whether he had done so or not, some of whom would have been ready enough to expose him, if he had made a claim that was notoriously untrue. It is true that we have nothing of the kind written by our Lord. But the first three Gospels were in circulation at a time when many of those who had been witnesses of Christ's ministry were still living, and nowhere do we find that any of such witnesses protested that the picture of Christ, as given in the Gospels, was extravagant. On the other hand, we do find that the Fourth Evangelist, while he tacitly corrects some of the details of the Synoptic narratives, enhances rather than tones down the miraculous element. There is, therefore, sufficient critical

reason for drawing a line of distinction between the miracles of the Old Testament and the miracles of the New. The evidence for the latter is very much stronger.

But some of those who object to this justifiable distinction propose to make a distinction in the N.T. miracles which is less justifiable.

There is difficulty about defining a miracle; but each person who has thought about it has a fairly clear idea as to what he means by the term. I should describe my own meaning both negatively and positively. *Negatively*, a miracle is not a violation of law. For God is not a God of disorder; οὐ γὰρ ἀκαταστασίας ὁ Θεός (1 Co 14³³): we cannot think of Him as constructing His universe in accordance with law and then violating the law Himself. Granting that He could do so if He willed, it is difficult to suppose that He ever would will to do so. *Positively*, a miracle is an exceptional and wonderful event which cannot be explained by any known natural law; and one of the conditions of its occurrence is that it should effect a beneficial result.

According to this view, which may or may not be correct, what is a miracle in one age may cease to be a miracle in a later age, because, in the interval, natural laws have been discovered which enable us to explain the wonderful occurrence, and which enable highly gifted persons to produce similar results. Many of the miracles wrought by Christ and His disciples would not be miracles now. We have discovered natural laws respecting the marvellous power which, in certain circumstances, mind has upon mind, and mind has upon matter, even when the acting mind and that upon which it acts are separated by considerable distance in space and time. Facts which are now well established respecting faith-healing, hypnotism, thought-reading, telepathy, and the like, enable us to explain, in some cases completely, in others partially, many of the miracles recorded in the N.T. They were rightly regarded as miraculous then, but, although still marvellous, they are not regarded as miraculous now. Most of the miracles of healing, whether of sick people or of demoniacs, and of knowing the unspoken thoughts of men, can wholly, or at least to a large extent, be explained through our increased knowledge of medical and psychological laws.

But there are other wonderful acts attributed to Christ which cannot be thus explained; such as

¹ 'It seems to me to be vital to guard against the thought of the Presence of the Lord "in or under the forms of bread and wine." From this the greatest practical errors follow.'

His satisfying thousands with food that would have sufficed for only a very few, His walking on the water, stilling a tempest, and raising the dead. These things are as fully miraculous to us as they were to those who witnessed them. We as yet know of nothing analogous to them. We know of no natural laws, by following which any human being, however gifted, could do the like. Here, therefore, there is a distinction in the N.T. miracles which may be reasonably made. There are the miracles which our present knowledge enables us to explain either wholly or in part, and there are those which at present we cannot explain at all. So far, we are on sure ground.

But, when we are asked to go further, and declare that the former are credible, because they are in accordance with known laws, but that the latter are incredible, because they are violations of known laws, we are asked to make a distinction for which we have no sufficient justification. How do we know that the latter are violations of law? They may look like violations of laws which we know, but they may be illustrations of laws which we do not know. We cannot, without presumption, make the assertion that they are violations of law, until all the laws in accordance with which God works in His universe are known to us. It is probable that even now we know only a fragment, and a small fragment, of them.

To take a single instance. It seems possible that before long some of our existing beliefs with regard to the constitution of matter will have to be revised. The discovery of radium, the increase in our knowledge of the nature and powers of electricity, and other dawning possibilities, are pointing the way to deep mysteries in nature, the probing of which may lead to a complete revolution of our convictions as to what is possible and what is impossible in the material universe.

Be this as it may. There is at any rate this momentous consideration. For those who in any real sense believe in the Incarnation, for those to whom Jesus Christ is an absolutely unique Personality, there ought to be grave hesitation and deep reluctance, if not positive refusal, to state, with anything approaching to confidence, what was impossible for Him in reference to the world of matter and of mind. We do not know the limits of our own powers, which of late have been found to be far greater than had been supposed; and it is indeed rash to be very positive about the limits of

His. His birth was the entrance of a new force into the world, analogous, to a very limited extent, to the first introduction of artificial fire. How incredible its powers must have seemed to those who had never seen it, and had hitherto had no experience of anything that could give intense heat and light other than the sun! Christ was, it is true, in the fullest and most real sense, man; and therefore there must have been limitations. But He was not a mere man. He was the Word of God made flesh; and therefore His birth, whether we accept the gospel account of it or not, was supernatural, and He Himself was unique. Neither before nor since has there been any being like Him. Are we, then, in a position to state, with anything like certainty, the conditions under which so unique a Personality would work in reference to the material world? We really know very little about such conditions. We have only imperfect knowledge of the conditions under which we ourselves work. As has just been intimated, the last half-century has taught us that our own powers are much larger than they had been believed to be, and limitations which had been supposed to be universal and stringent have been found to be non-existent. It appears to follow from this that it is presumptuous to draw a hard-and-fast line of division between the miracles which have been attributed, on good authority, to our Lord, and to say that some, though marvellous, are in harmony with our experience, and are therefore credible, but that others are contrary to our experience, and are therefore incredible. Here also we seem to have a sphere in which it is wise to profess a reverent agnosticism, and to say that we do not possess the knowledge which would justify us in asserting, 'It is impossible to believe that Jesus Christ did these things.'

Before concluding, it may be worth while to make clear what is not urged in this paper and what is.

It is *not* urged, with regard to religious truth, that in all cases in which certainty is unattainable it is our duty to abstain from forming an opinion and having a belief. That is a question which each person must decide for himself. For many people it might be beneficial to have a belief, and to cherish it as a guide to thought and conduct, until it has been proved to be untenable. A belief carefully and patiently reached would be likely to be an approximation to the truth. For other

people it might be wise not to perplex themselves with insoluble problems. Let each person be persuaded in his own mind.

What *is* urged is, that in all cases in which certainty is unattainable it is our duty to abstain from condemning other Christians for not thinking as we do respecting them. Our ignorance ought to be known to ourselves, and, when occasion arises, confessed to others. Religious truth is a very large thing, and none of us grasps more than a fragment of it. The fragment which other people grasp may be very different from our own, and yet, for all that, they may be justified in believing that it is true. As John Henry Newman

has reminded us, there are regions of thought in which something that we know to be false is the nearest approach that our minds can make to the truth.

The recognition of this fact, namely, the largeness of the field in which Christian Agnosticism can be exhibited, gives full justification to the comprehensiveness which is one of the great glories of the English Church. In it Low, Broad, and High can all find a place, and hold it with a good conscience, because the points respecting which each individual differs from his brethren are questions about which neither reason nor revelation gives any sufficiently certain decision.

Literature.

JOHN SMYTH.

IT is a multitude which no man can number that has gone and goes by the name of John Smith. No wonder if one of them should drop out of sight. Browne and Robinson succeeded in holding their place among the Pilgrim Fathers, but Smith (as he spelt his name at first) died early and was forgotten. It is only within quite recent years that industrious and loyal historians like Shakespeare and Burgess and Burrage and Whitley have recovered him his true place in the conquest of America and the calendar of saints.

Dr. W. T. Whitley is not only the latest and greatest of John Smyth's biographers; he is also the editor of his works. The title is *The Works of John Smyth, Fellow of Christ's College, 1594-98* (Cambridge: At the University Press; 2 vols., 3rs. 6d. net). And the works will do more than all the biographies to give their author a place in literature and in our regard. Dr. Whitley's introduction is fine biographical work, the Baptist and the scholar being most happily harmonized in him. But the biography is Dr. Whitley's; the works are John Smyth's own. We shall remember the editor by the one, the author by the other.

With what surprise do we recognize the originality and insight of the exposition of the Lord's Prayer, which occupies nearly two hundred pages of the first volume. When Dr. Nestle wrote his article on the Lord's Prayer for the *DICTIONARY*

OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS, he made a great effort to record all the literature; but he did not know John Smyth. Dr. Whitley has rescued it from one or other of the libraries where it has lain unstudied all this time. How Nestle would have relished the quaint discussion of the words 'After this manner pray ye.' Smyth says: 'The meaning of which words must needs be one of these things following, that is to say; Pray either

1. These words onely: or
 2. This matter onely: or
 3. In this method onely: or
 4. These words and matter: or
 5. These words and method: or
 6. This matter in this method: or
 7. These words, and this matter, in this method.'
- Now, which does he conclude it is?

HOMER AND HISTORY.

In calling his new book *Homer and History* (Macmillan; 12s. net) Dr. Walter Leaf tells us that his desire is to make the study of the Homeric poems a contribution to history. He is not to be engaged with either æsthetics or literary criticism. He tells us, in short, that he is returning to his old pet theme and hoping to prove that 'the poems really do depict, as contemporaries, the Achaian age, as they profess.'

Dr. Leaf starts, as all historical criticism of Homer must now start, with the discovery of

Mycenæan Troy. That fixed mark separates the old from the new. The old criticism largely denied the reality of the Trojan War, and as a consequence found itself, like the fallen angels, 'in wandering mazes lost.' The new criticism has Schliemann's spade behind it, a respectable fact. Henceforth every theory must begin with that; and henceforth 'it will rest with the spade to say if this or any other temporary solution of the Homeric problem is right or wrong.'

Two theories, which *might* be consistent with the fact of the Trojan War, are cleared out of the way. One is called *Sagenverschiebung*, the transference of legends from one place to another. Dr. Leaf does not believe that the Trojan War took place in Central Greece, and was transferred by tradition or migration to the Troad. The other is the theory of 'faded' gods. Dr. Leaf does not believe that the Homeric heroes were originally gods and were watered down into men. The human mind works the other way. Men are often elevated to the high rank of gods, sometimes during their lifetime; they are never, either in ritual or in poetry, degraded from the rank of gods to the rank of men. The heroes of Homer—Achilles, Hector, Odysseus, and the rest—were men of like passions such as we are.

And so, when the gods or goddesses take part in the affairs of men, their part is purely poetical. It may be removed without loss to the story, except of picturesqueness, and without taking anything away from its historical credibility.

Not only does Dr. Leaf recognize the history behind the poetry of Homer; he believes that Homer himself recognized it, and that that is what he meant by Fate. 'The Homeric conception of Fate is of a mysterious power in the background to which at critical moments in the story Zeus himself is subordinate. It is symbolized in the Scales of Zeus, to which the Father of Gods has to appeal to learn what his decision must be. In the decisive moment of Hector's struggle with Achilles, Zeus hangs his scales to learn what the outcome is to be; and Hector's doom sinks down. Why is this? Surely because the positive datum of the legend told that Hector was actually slain; that was something which the poet could not deny or the god himself make undone:

non tamen irritum
diffinget infectumque reddet
quod fugiens semel hora uexit.

'The poet has to acknowledge that there are certain data which he regards as historical, as things done, with which he himself must not tamper; neither, therefore, can the epiphenomenon, Zeus, tamper with them; the decision is not with Zeus, but must be attributed to Fate. To Homer, in fact, if I may say so without undue levity, Fate is the *fait accompli*.'

Dr. Leaf does not accept the catalogue of the ships. It is neither Homeric nor historical. The rest he does accept. No doubt there are secondary persons and secondary events which are due to the imagination of the poet. How many and who or what they are is 'proper subject for inquiry.' But 'the names which are celebrated as those of the heroes who fought before Troy are the real names of the Achaian leaders. Agamemnon was a real king of Mykene and overlord of all the Argives; and I am not afraid of the conclusion, however humorously put, that "Menelaos was a well-known infantry officer with auburn whiskers." That is, I think, substantially true, though I would not pin my faith on the colour of his hair. That he was brother of Agamemnon I do not doubt.'

MIND IN EVOLUTION.

In issuing the second edition (after fourteen years) of his book on *Mind in Evolution* (Macmillan; 10s. net), Professor L. T. Hobhouse writes a striking short preface, of which this is the most striking part:

'In some material respects I have found it necessary to modify opinions formed on the data available in 1900. In particular, the observations of Mr. H. S. Jennings have shown me that something of the nature of mind is to be carried further down in the organic world than I supposed. His results, together with other work in general psychology, have led me, however, to extend rather than to narrow the view taken in the first edition of the function of mind in evolution, and even to raise the question whether mind (in the infinitely varied forms of its activity, from the groping of unconscious effort to the full clearness of conscious purpose) may not be the essential driving force in all evolutionary change. In any case, the revolution which has overtaken biological theory during the same period is profound. Its significance is as yet imperfectly grasped, but it will, I believe,

be found, as time goes on, to have invested the constitution of the living being as against the environing conditions with a new importance, and in this constitution the fundamental fact everywhere is that the living being is not passive but active, not mechanical in its reaction to things, but assertive, plastic, and, in a measure proportioned to its development, self-determining. If this is so, psychology will in the future have a larger part to play than has hitherto been supposed in the study of the rise and decay of forms of life.'

One can easily understand, after reading these words, that the book is considerably altered. It is so. The fundamental idea, that mind is an evolution along with the rest of the personality, remains. We may agree with it or we may differ from it—there is no new evidence to convert the unbeliever—but there it is. And now there is added to it the idea of the mind being an active factor in its own evolution—an idea which may carry Professor Hobhouse further than he sees.

THE RED INDIANS OF THE PLAINS.

The Red Indians of the Plains is the title which the Rev. J. Hines has given to his record of thirty years' missionary experience in the Saskatchewan (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net). Mr. Hines makes no attempt to tell an artistic story, and yet his directness of statement makes better reading than the most perfectly constructed paragraphs. He makes no attempt to repeat good anecdotes, but the circumstantial plainness of his own actual experience is more convincing as well as more entertaining than the professional story-teller's well-dressed narrative. Without the least encouragement from art we read the book from cover to cover, always at home with the author, always interested in his interests, always sharing his defects and rejoicing over his rare but delightful victories.

Sometimes his work was delicate as well as difficult. 'About this time I had quite a strange experience, one which I think may be described as almost unique among the clergy. It was this. One of my Indians at Sandy Lake paid me a visit, and remained rather longer than I thought was necessary, considering the conversation that passed between us, but I felt sure he had some object in staying so long, and, in order to help him to unburden his mind, I suggested that if he had

nothing more to say he had better be going, as I could not spare him any more of my time. He said he had come to see me on some very important business. Then I replied, "Proceed to business at once." "Well," he said, "it is about six months since my wife died, and, just before she left me, she said in the presence of witnesses that, if I remained single until the following spring, I was to get married again, and, as the leaves are already big on the trees, I have come to see you and hear what you have to say about this. . . . I do not want to be troubled with an old woman, and I do not suppose a young woman would care to be troubled with me; I want a woman about my own age." I was more than pleased with his remarks, and thought they savoured of much premeditated thought, so, knowing a widow woman about his own age, whom I had noticed taking great interest in his bereaved children, I mentioned her name as being a suitable person. "Ah!" he said, "I knew you were always guided by the Great Spirit in all you undertake; that is the very woman I have been thinking about, and how could you have known this, unless the Great Spirit had guided your judgment?" "Well," I replied, "I am glad that you look at it in that way; now you had better go and propose to her." "No," said he, "I cannot do that. If I knew she would say 'Yes,' I should go, but she might say 'No,' and Indians never like to have their petitions rejected when they go on business of that nature." "Then I asked him what he intended doing. "Why, sir," he said, "I want you to propose for me!" Well, I was in a fix! but having yielded so far to his request, I felt bound in some way to go on to the end. So having obtained my wife's permission, I called on the widow at my earliest convenience and explained matters to her, taking great pains to make her understand I was proposing for the other fellow, and not for myself. Yes, I assure you, necessity was laid upon me to do this, because, as I have said, men in those early days did have two wives, and she might think I had some sinister motive in speaking to her about the subject of matrimony. My mission was successful, and in due course they were lawfully married, and the union proved a happy one. Before leaving this subject I would like to ask any of my clerical readers if any of their parishioners ever had such implicit confidence in their judgment and tact as to trust them with negotiations

of such a delicate nature as this one entrusted to me?’

FABRE D'OLIVET.

Fabre d'Olivet died in 1825, after suffering, as he believed, from the jealousy of Napoleon. If he had misfortunes in his lifetime he has now had the rare good fortune of finding a convert and translator in the person of Nayán Louise Redfield. The work which has been translated is entitled *Hermeneutic Interpretation of the Origin of the Social State of Man and of the Destiny of the Adamic Race* (Putnam; 15s. net). It is a volume of more than six hundred large octavo pages (including the author's Introduction), but it is only a part, and a small part, of the work which M. d'Olivet intended to write. He says: 'The work that I am publishing on the social state of man was destined at first to become part of a more considerable work that I had planned upon the history of the world and its inhabitants, and for which I had collected much material. My intention was to present from the same point of view, and in effective arrangement, a general history of the globe that we inhabit, under all the relations of history, natural and political, physical and metaphysical, civil and religious, from the origin of things to their last developments, in such a way as to describe without any prejudice the cosmogonical and geological systems of all peoples, their religious and political doctrines, their governments, customs, and diverse relations; the reciprocal influence which they exercise upon civilization, their movements upon the earth, and the fortunate or unfortunate events which describe their existence more or less agitated, more or less long, more or less interesting; in order to draw from all this, knowledge more extensive and more sure than has hitherto been obtained upon the intimate nature of things, and, above all, that of Man, whom it is most important to understand.'

The difficulty which M. d'Olivet experienced was not in collecting his materials, but in interpreting them. He found that every author and every book in the ancient world had been utterly misunderstood and misrepresented by modern writers, and it was necessary for him, first of all, to lay down rules of interpretation. The very language in which the ancients wrote has been misunderstood. Before he could do anything with

the Bible he had to write a large book on the Hebrew language, wholly overturning all the grammarians and lexicographers and all their works. This involved him in controversy 'which carried its venom,' he says, 'into the very precincts of my domestic fireside'; and, instead of helping, greatly hindered the production of his history of the world.

Fabre d'Olivet was an occultist. In the words of his translator, he is 'the great metaphysician of Esotericism of the nineteenth century, who penetrated far into the crypt of fallen sanctuaries to the tabernacle of the most mysterious arcanas.' His book has been translated and published opportunely. The number of those who are at the present time taken up with efforts to reach 'the most mysterious arcanas' is very great. It is quite possible that the prophecy of the translator will now be fulfilled, and he whom his contemporaries looked upon as a visionary or a fool, will be said to be truly described as a man of genius, who, 'transcendental in his intelligence and with his attributes of seer, has "cleared the luminous path," has penetrated the mysteries of the Bible, and given to us not only the visions of a lost past, but has esoterically interpreted its symbols.'

PREHISTORIC MAN.

That 'the proper study of mankind is man' may not be true, but it is the most widely interesting study. Its interest makes us look before and after. We have almost made our day notorious for the foolishness of our attempts to see the unseen and anticipate the future. And we are only a little less interested in the prehistoric past.

A book with the title of *Prehistoric Man and his Story* (Seeley; 7s. 6d. net) will find us at once. Is it reliable? Is it readable? It is both, for its author is Professor G. F. Scott Elliot. It is a rather rare result of the scientific and the artistic temperaments working harmoniously to one end. And its attraction is added to by the illustrations that have been first so cleverly devised and then so plentifully scattered through its pages. Here is the Old Man of Cromagnon restored to his figure and face as when alive (under the direction of Professor Rutot of Brussels) and then photographed. And here also are all the other early types, quite lifelike and quite companionable

—except perhaps the Neanderthal Man, who does look a little off type.

They who have been content with Milton's universe as Masson has described and drawn it will have their complacency disturbed if they read *The Universe as Pictured in Milton's Paradise Lost*, by William Fairfield Warren, Professor of Religions and Religion in Boston University (Abingdon Press; 75 cents net). In 'ten short paragraphs' Professor Warren gives us *his* conception of the Universe of Milton, and carries conviction. He adds to it some complicated but surprisingly luminous diagrams. One of them is a diagram of the Babylonian Universe. It differs utterly from Dr. Owen C. Whitehouse's diagram in the DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, which has been so frequently praised and copied. If the Babylonian is the original of the Hebrew conception of the Universe, Dr. Whitehouse is nearer the truth, for it is certain that he meets better the demands of the Creation narrative in Genesis.

The Rev. Charles Fremont Sitterly, Professor in Drew Theological Seminary, has published a new translation and commentary on the Book of the Acts of the Apostles. He has chosen for title *Jerusalem to Rome* (Abingdon Press; \$1.50 net).

The translation is in the language of to-day, with recollections of the Authorized Version. Take this passage:

'As he was making his defense, Festus called out, loudly,

"You are mad, Paul! Your great learning is driving you into insanity."

"I am not mad, most noble Festus," said Paul, "but am speaking words of sober truth. For the king knows about these matters, and I am speaking to him without constraint. I do not believe that any of these things is obscure to him, for this has not happened in a corner. You believe the prophets, King Agrippa? I know you believe them."

"In a little while you will persuade yourself that you have made me a Christian," said Agrippa.

"I would to God," said Paul, "that whether in a little while or longer, not only you but all my hearers to-day, might become such as I am—except for these chains."

The commentary is as new as the translation.

It is not an explanation of the words of the text; it is a paraphrase of its thought. This is the commentary on the last of the words already quoted:

'Now Paul is compelled to stop. Even Agrippa cannot be catechized before so mixed an audience by a state's prisoner, especially on matters of personal belief. He could not answer truthfully that he believed the prophets in any sense comparable with Paul's high belief, and as Festus his host has plainly become anxious to end the hearing, he replies with half-seriousness and a trifle of irony: "At this rate you'll be saying in a moment I'm a Christian! You are persuaded I'm a believer like you in the Prophets; with a little more effort you'll reach the conviction I'm a believer in the Nazarene!"

'Paul is distressed, but he answers, sincerely,

"I deeply wish that whether by little or larger effort I might persuade both your Majesty and all who are here present this day to become indeed Christians like myself—not, of course, including these chains." Thus with courtly courtesy, mingled with a touch of humor, Paul raises his manacled hands and says the last word.'

The book is beautifully printed and appropriately illustrated.

Is there any writing so difficult as the writing of an introduction to another man's book? Professor Gilbert Murray has written an introduction to Mr. J. A. K. Thomson's *The Greek Tradition* (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net), and has shown that it can be done, and how. There is the risk that Mr. Thomson's work may be misapprehended. He is not content to construe and translate; he seeks to know what the poem meant, what there is fine about it, and how it came to be what it is. Now these questions demand the use of the imagination, and Professor Murray thinks that teachers do not use the imagination or teach the use of it. So Mr. Thomson may be misunderstood, and we are thoroughly interested in Mr. Thomson before we begin his book.

The subjects are various—'An Old Map,' 'Thucydides,' and the like, or unlike. But they are all well-informed and imaginative. This is the characteristic of the volume from beginning to end. This makes it a book. There is the most exact scholarship and there is the most imaginative interpretation, and these two excellences are fused in a higher excellence, a unity of thought and

feeling which makes literature. One of the most arresting of the papers is an essay on 'The Springs of Poetry,' from which a short quotation may be made. Mr. Thomson says: 'The emotion (if we may call it that) which is touched by poetry and expressed in it is a sense of the solidarity of our being with that of nature and our fellow-men. What I mean by this it will be the business of the following pages to explain. Meanwhile I simply state the argument: which is that, the further back we trace it, the more conscious and realized is this feeling of the unity of man's life with that of the beasts and plants and stones, and the more nearly does poetry approach the nature of a spell which aims at evoking this sentiment. And I conclude that poetry is still essentially a spell or charm (*carmen*), awakening or reawakening the sense that we are organic with the world.'

It is surely a proof that we did not want war that so many English men and women are striving to lay down the conditions of peace. If we had wanted war we should have had the conditions of peace settled in our minds before the war began. No warning, no education, would have been needed. It is the surprise of the situation that drives us to the consideration of the great questions which are before us when the war is over. We cannot be too considerate of them. Let us therefore read and read again, and let us exercise our own judgment on, the essays in a book which Mr. Charles Roden Buxton has edited. Its title is *Towards a Lasting Settlement* (Allen & Unwin; 2s. 6d. net). Mr. Lowes Dickinson writes on 'The Basis of Permanent Peace'; Mr. Buxton himself on 'Nationality'; and there are other able writers, men and women, on 'The Freedom of the Seas,' 'The Open Door,' 'The Parallel of the Great French War,' 'War and the Women's Movement,' 'The Organization of Peace,' 'Democracy and Publicity in Foreign Affairs,' 'The Democratic Principle and International Relations.'

Were you aware that there is such a thing in the newspapers—in some newspapers—as 'third leaders'? They do not deal with the political questions of the moment. They deal with any literary or social matter of any moment whatever, from Curiosity to Castles in the Air.

The *Times* has 'third leaders.' Dr. J. W.

Mackail has written an introduction to a bookful of them. The title is *Modern Essays* (Arnold; 5s. net). Dr. Mackail warns us against reading the book as a book. Read an essay at a time, he says. This advice is given for the sake of the essays as much as for our sake. But one of the essays is on the subject of giving advice, and one on taking it. And we are encouraged to disregard Dr. Mackail and read as we please. One advantage of reading right on is that we become interested in the writers. They are never named, so we compare style, ideas, temperaments, and wonder if this is the work of So-and-so and that of such another. And we gain a new conception of the strangeness of the human mind that it can look at things in so many different ways and never lose its interest in them.

Messrs. Bell & Sons have issued Dr. Holland Rose's great estimate of our 'great commoner' in a cheap edition. The title is *William Pitt and National Revival* (7s. 6d. net). It is a book to be read by everybody. For it opens the way to a solution of those questions of nationality and justice which every thinking person must seek a solution of—questions which are with us now but will become very urgent upon us as soon as the war is over.

A History of Political Economy, by Dr. John Kells Ingram, still holds its ground, though the whole science of Political Economy is now declared to be dead and buried. A new edition has been prepared and a supplementary chapter added by Professor W. A. Scott, LL.D., of the University of Wisconsin. The Introduction has been contributed by Professor R. T. Ely, LL.D., of the same university (A. & C. Black; 7s. 6d. net). Professor Scott's chapter is entitled 'The Austrian School and Recent Developments.' There is not a better chapter in the book. Under 'recent developments' every great country in Europe is surveyed, together with the United States of America, and a most valuable bibliography is added to each section. In the Introduction, Dr. Ely gives one a good idea of Ingram's personality while estimating his work and influence. 'Ingram,' he says, 'was a leader among a group of men who have been successful in introducing humanitarianism into political economy. No attempt can be made here and now to apportion credit among those who belong

to this group, but for England and America no inconsiderable proportion of it belongs to Dr. Ingram. He did his man's part.'

Very useful at this time will be the able *Analysis of Mill's Principles of Political Economy* which has been made by Mr. L. Oldershaw, M.A. (Blackwell; 2s. 6d. net).

A selection of *Tales by Polish Authors*, translated by Else C. M. Benecke, has been issued by Mr. Blackwell of Oxford (3s. 6d. net). Its contents are 'Bartek the Conqueror,' by Henryk Sienkiewicz; 'Twilight' and 'Temptation,' by Stefan Zeromski; 'Srul—from Lubartów,' by Adam Szymański; 'In Autumn' and 'In Sacrifice to the Gods,' by Wacław Sieroszewski. The little volume will be a surprise. The popular literature of Poland is translatable, and it is worth translating.

The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius Loyola are now within reach of everybody in a new translation by the Rev. Joseph Rickaby, S.J. (Burns & Oates; 5s. net). The translation is printed in parallel column with the Spanish. Then Mr. Rickaby adds Notes which are both explanatory and apologetic. It is right that Protestants should know what the Exercises are; it is right that they should know how they are still defended. Take the statement by Loyola that after His resurrection Christ appeared first to the Virgin Mary. Mr. Rickaby quotes St. Teresa to the same effect, and then tells us that 'the Evangelists are silent on the point for other reasons and perhaps also for this, that Mary was not an Apostle, and it was their concern to narrate the appearances of our Risen Lord to His Apostles, appearances official as well as personal and consolatory, to those *pre-ordained witnesses of the resurrection*, by whose testimony the rest of the Church has been assured of the fact.'

The Rev. John Roscoe's book on the Baganda is one of our best authorities on the religion of the tribes of Africa. No other book of his could be quite so valuable, for it is the Baganda alone that he knows intimately. But he knows the Northern Bantu as well as anybody else—the Banyoro, the Banyankole, the Bakene, the Bagesu, and the Basoga; and even of the Nilotic tribes, the Bateso and the Kavirondo, he knows a little. He has,

besides, the gifts and the training that are requisite. So he has written down all that he knows of all those tribes, and his book has been published at the Cambridge University Press under the title of *The Northern Bantu* (12s. 6d. net).

It is said that when you go to live among savages they seem to you at first to be all alike, but after a time they differ from one another just as Europeans do. So is it with their customs and their beliefs. A little knowledge sees sameness; a more careful study finds endless diversity. Mr. Roscoe has described each tribe by itself. He sees the differences, and he makes us see them.

The volume of *Morning Rays* for 1915 is out (R. & R. Clark; 1s. net). Its editor is still the Rev. Harry Smith, and he edits it as conscientiously as ever.

Messrs. Constable have reissued the College addresses of Professor F. G. Peabody of Harvard. It is a good deed, for which many a Christian pastor in this land will be grateful. The reissue is not less attractive than the original. There are four volumes—*Mornings in the College Chapel* (2 vols., 2s. net each), *Afternoons in the College Chapel* (2s. net), *Sunday Evenings in the College Chapel* (2s. net).

Mr. Arnold J. Toynbee has written a sequel to his fine book on *Nationality and the War*, and has called it *The New Europe* (Dent; 1s. 6d. net). He is deeply concerned about the war; he is as deeply concerned about the peace that is to follow. One thing is clear to him—the settlement must be along the lines of nationality. But how to keep these lines and get the various nations to work harmoniously with one another—that is the question. Mr. Toynbee turns to the United States of America. The States submit their individual sovereignty to a federal organ, and invest this authority with responsibility and real power. Why not induce the nations of Europe to do likewise?

Under the title of *The Magic of Experience* (Dent; 2s. 6d. net), Mr. H. Stanley Redgrove has published a short statement of his philosophy. What is his philosophy? To save misnaming he names it himself: 'If my own views must be labelled, then I would prefer the label to be one of my own choosing, and I do not think that I can

choose a better one than "Idealistic or Rational Empiricism." I use the term "empiricism," because I believe that no true knowledge is attainable apart from experience. I use the term "rational," because I believe that bare experience is not sufficient for this end: experience must be interpreted by reason.

This Rational Empiricism he explains in three parts, one part discussing Idealism, one Mysticism, and one the Nature and Criteria of Truth. The chapter on Mysticism is surprisingly sympathetic; for Mr. Redgrove holds firmly that mysticism is not opposed to reason. On the contrary, 'Mysticism is the spirit of reason in religion.' What, then, does he mean by reason? He answers: "Not a cold, formal rationalism, a thing as much to be deplored as an unhealthy emotionalism, but a spirit of rationality in which the heart joins forces with the head, and the feelings are given due place. The faith of the mystic is not founded upon the statements of other men, but on the facts of his own consciousness; his religion and his reason are indissolubly united, and as Emerson well remarks: "When all is said and done, the rapt saint is found the only logician."

A book on *The Doctrine of the Atonement* (Duckworth; 2s. 6d. net) from so competent a theologian as Mr. J. K. Mozley, M.A., is pretty sure of a welcome. Inevitably perhaps, though we should say sorrowfully, Mr. Mozley has had to treat the subject historically and discuss the theories so often discussed already. But when we reach the seventh, which is the last chapter, we reach Mr. Mozley himself.

He believes in the Atonement. It is a fact, historical, religious, moral. It is a supernatural fact, however. And being supernatural it is incapable of demonstration. It is a mystery. In any attempt to explain it, three things have to be taken account of—the meaning of the Bible, the meaning of the moral consciousness, and the meaning of Christian religious experience. In all these things there is mystery, and the Atonement is the mystery of mysteries.

Whereupon Mr. Mozley proceeds to explain the mystery, and shows that with the right exercise of a right faith the mystery may become not only credible, but the greatest of fructifying facts for heart and life.

In his new volume of sermons, *Times of Refresh-*

ing (Griffiths; 1s. net), the Rev. J. Neville Figgis endeavours to show what the Gospel of the grace of God is good for in these days of little theology and much suffering. He encourages us all to become mystics; but he knows that the trouble has first to be dealt with, the Tragedy of the World, as he calls it, and his best sermon is on salvation from sin.

Mr. Harry Goodman, who writes on *God, the World, and the War* (Heffer; 6d. net), has little faith in the progress of the world, but much in the progress of the men and women that pass through it. So war does not shake his faith. It is one of God's tools, the rod in His hand, for our training.

Mr. W. F. Henderson of Edinburgh has issued a new and improved edition of *The Pastor's Diary and Clerical Record* (2s. net). It has been prepared by the Rev. Louis H. Jordan, B.D.

Partly prose and partly poetry, but all sincere and helpful, is the little book of consolation which Professor David Smith has written (Hodder & Stoughton; 1s. net). Its title is *To the Uttermost*.

Under the title of *A Letter to You* (Hodder & Stoughton; 1s. net), a number of letters have been published under the editorship of the Rev. R. H. Fisher, D.D., editor of *Life and Work*. One is a letter to Our Soldiers at the Front; one to Sailors on the Sea, one to Toilers in the Fields, and so on. The writers are nearly all ministers of the Church of Scotland. Professor Milligan writes the letter to Children, not missing his opportunity.

The Rev. John A. Hutton, D.D., has made himself familiar with the popular literature of our time, both unmoral and anti-religious. His verdict is that, on the whole, it is ephemeral. It takes too little account of the instincts of our nature, too little of the way by which we have come and the experience we have gathered. He writes a book on *Ancestral Voices* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). He sets the 'ancestral voices' against the mushroom theories of life that are so plentiful. He has the gift of popular approach unsurpassed by the most pestilential writer, and he uses it. Half the book deals with 'the Sense of Sin in Great Literature,' a timely topic, which he handles fairly but quite

courageously, and without a moment's thought of compromise between Christ and the World.

The Rev. J. N. Ogilvie, D.D., being appointed Baird Lecturer for 1915, chose *The Apostles of India* as the subject of lecture. The volume is now issued (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). It adds to the range of the Baird Lectures. At the one extremity may be placed Dickson's exposition of the 'Pauline Conception of Flesh and Spirit,' at the other Ogilvie's 'Apostles of India.' This is a popular book. Dr. Ogilvie desires to commend Foreign Missions to the multitude. And he knows that the multitude is more interested in persons than in causes. So he writes short appreciative biographies of the great men who have given themselves to the Christianizing of India, from St. Thomas to Alexander Duff. The task has demanded much reading. And as Dr. Ogilvie is no ordinary popularizer of other men's research, it has involved not a little verification. The chief merit of the book, however, is that each of these Indian 'apostles' is clearly seen in himself and in his work, a living personality doing that which no other man but himself was called to do.

The evangelical doctrine of the Church needs ever new exposition. Men persist in calling it 'low.' It is really so high that only the utmost loyalty to Christ enables one to attain to it. Canon J. G. Simpson has given a brief exposition of *The Conception of the Church*, as he understands it (Longmans; 1s. net). He understands it very well.

Under the title of *The Light Within* (Longmans; 9s. net), the Rev. Charles Lewis Slattery, D.D., Rector of Grace Church in New York, has published a study of the Holy Spirit. It is a study of human history. Dr. Slattery finds the work of the Holy Spirit in the life of man. Quicquid agunt homines—what men do, that is the doing of the Holy Spirit of God. There may be grieving here and quenching there; but wherever Christ can see of the travail of His soul in the progress of the centuries, there is the operation of the Holy Ghost.

There is first a chapter on the thirst for God; next a short history of the Holy Spirit's presence in the world before Christ; the New Testament phenomena occupy five chapters following; then

the promise is seen to be fulfilled in two thousand years' enjoyment of the life that is the light of men. The last chapter is a forecast of the future.

Here then is no repetition of familiar formulæ. The great doctrine of the Holy Spirit is lifted out of the timidity of credal definition or scriptural quotation and made part of our everyday belief, our everyday life.

The War and the Kingdom of God is the title of a volume of essays edited by Mr. G. K. A. Bell, M.A. (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net). Canon H. L. Goudge writes on 'Christianity and War,' and on 'The Prayers of the Church in Time of War,' Canon Peter Green on 'The Humiliation of War,' Canon J. G. Simpson on 'The Witness of the Church in Time of War,' and Canon Scott Holland on 'The Work of the Church after the War.' The editor himself writes an Introduction. The whole purpose of the book, the purpose of the editor and of every writer in it, is to prepare us for the end of the war. It has happened this time, they seem to say, let it never happen again. Let the Church of Christ see to it that it shall never happen again. They ask what war is, what peace is; they expect that in future we shall study both peace and war more than we have done and preach more about them. We have partly drifted into this war, partly been driven; let us see to it that we neither drift nor are driven into another. The Church of Christ can put an end to war if it will.

In a book of two hundred pages Mr. J. W. Powell answers the question, *What is a Christian?* (Macmillan; 4s. 6d. net). It is a question which could occupy volumes. Mr. Powell selects his aspects. The selection is determined by the war. What is a Christian? The question arises because so many say that Christianity has broken down. The conclusion is that Christianity has not had a chance. They who have made the war are not Christians.

Mr. Stephen Paget has an enviable way with young people. His *Essays for Boys and Girls*, in which he offers 'A First Guide toward the Study of the War' (Macmillan; 5s. net), is as fine a combination of good writing and healthy thinking as boy or girl is ever likely to see; and it is all their own, not an adult within sight. More than

all other things there is in the book education in patriotism. It is not the patriotism of the jingo variety, or of the peace-at-any-price variety; it is the patriotism that has faith enough in God to make the great venture. The book is illustrated by nine of the famous *Punch* cartoons.

Of the books which have been written since the War began for the purpose of making clear the political situation, one of the best is *The War and Democracy* (Macmillan; 2s. net). It contains eight chapters written by Mr. Alfred E. Zimmern, Mr. J. Dover Wilson, Dr. R. W. Seton-Watson, and Mr. Arthur Greenwood. These men are all thinkers and writers, and they have distributed the topics according to their several ability. The most important topic for us to study at this stage is nationality. It runs through the whole book, but is explained most systematically by Mr. Dover Wilson in the second chapter on 'The National Idea in Europe, 1789-1914.' The book deserves the widest circulation, and to secure that the publishers have put a merely nominal price upon it.

The Rev. Cyril Hepher recently gave an account of his experiences of silent prayer. The circumstances of his first contact with it arrested the attention; his evident sincerity and unwilling conviction made so great an impression that he has been encouraged to write yet another book on the same subject, that he may deepen the impression already made and record his fuller experience. He calls the new book *The Fruits of Silence* (Macmillan; 4s. 6d. net). What does it mean? It is simply that Mr. Hepher has entered upon the practice of the presence of God unwittingly, and for the old familiar language of the mystic uses a modern terminology? If that is so, then let us enter with him by this open door. Surely we can pray silently. Surely we can wait upon God and be still.

Why do so many Irish stories 'bring the eternal note of sadness in'? Katherine Tynan has published a volume of short stories, calling it *Countrymen All* (Maunsell; 2s. net). They are all pathetic. Some of them are poignantly pathetic, relieved from the madness of sorrow only by the author's consummate art. What is it that throws this atmosphere round the literature of Ireland? Its history? Its climate? Its heredity? The Irish-

man is anything but morose; it is not mere disposition. With wonderful skill, as if it were instinctive, Katherine Tynan gives every tale its own colour; the pathos is always there, the variety is the most pathetic thing about it.

Mr. George W. Russell, who writes as 'A. E.,' has published a volume of *Imaginations and Reveries* (Maunsell; 5s. net). They are not so difficult as his poetry; they are not less thoughtful.

There is nothing in literature more notable at this moment than the work of Irish men and women. No one can be unconscious of its significance. They are themselves so conscious of it that they have begun to consider whether it is to be national or cosmopolitan. In one of his essays Mr. Russell discusses the question. He feels the pull of Dante and of Milton; why should Ireland not receive of the wide world's gifts and give of its best in return? He believes that that can all be, if the Irish literature is truly national. Every country is an ideal to its own. Let Irish authors offer the Irish everywhere a true and lofty ideal, whether by using the ancient heroes—Cúchulain, Fionn, Ossian, and Oscar—or by lifting up new heroes into the place of the ideal. Then the literature of Ireland will be Irish and will claim the homage of Irishmen, while it will also take its place, if worthy, in the literature of the world. Balzac and Tolstoy are ours, yet Balzac is French and Tolstoy is Russian. Why should not Katherine Tynan, and let us say A. E. himself, be both Irish and cosmopolitan? Dante became the world's *because* he chose the Italian language and wrote as an Italian. It is a much debated matter, but the solution is certain if Irish authors have courage enough.

This, however, is only one essay. Every essay in the book is to be read and reckoned with.

The Rev. Alexander Smellie, D.D., has published four addresses on Sanctification. The title is *Lift up your Heart* (Melrose; 2s. net). They are addresses, not essays, not sermons. The audience is near and in complete sympathy. The heart of the matter is that he and they believe that sanctification—holiness of heart and life—is possible, possible for them. And they go together to find it. They go the way first of the Cross, next of the Spirit, then of Faith, and lastly of Prayer.

One striking result of the War is the way in which it has stirred the universities, and not only to fight but also to write about the fighting. The Oxford Pamphlets and the Papers for War-Time are mostly the work of university dons; and there are quite a number of books besides, great and small. Of them all nothing seems to us to be more after the mind of Christ or more strengthening than the work of Mr. F. R. Barry, Fellow and Lecturer in Theology in Oriel College, Oxford. His new book is *Religion and the War* (Methuen; 1s. net).

How is *The Pacific Northwest Pulpit* meeting the problems of modern life? The answer is to be found in a volume with that title compiled by Mr. Paul Little and issued by the Methodist Book Concern (\$1 net). The Pacific Northwest Pulpit is concerned wholly with the problems of modern life; what is local and temporary even in the Gospels is passed by. But it is in the Gospels that these modern preachers find the things that make for peace in the present. They use new language, as when the Rev. Francis Burgette Short, of the First Church, Spokane, Washington, speaks of 'Brother Enoch,' or President Charles Lincoln Bovard, of Helena, Montana, discusses the Sin of Stupidity; but they have no new remedy for any sin, and no new prospect of any brotherhood but in Christ Jesus.

The twentieth century, said a great German, belongs to the Germans. He made a mistake. The twentieth century belongs to women. The Germans will have to wait. In every country women are making their presence felt; in every country they are the object of study and consideration. Miss A. M. Bacon wrote recently on 'Japanese Girls and Women.' Now Mr. Sidney L. Gulick writes on *Working Women of Japan* (Missionary Education Movement; 50 cents net). It is a sad, indeed a shameful story.

The Rev. Samuel A. B. Mercer, Ph.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament in the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago, has had the good fortune to be able to publish the Liturgy at present used in the Abyssinian Church. Known to be a student of liturgies, he was appointed Hale Lecturer for 1914-15, and the subject of *The Ethiopic Liturgy* was assigned to him. Under that title he has now issued the lectures in a

volume of rare good scholarship and unexpected worth (Mowbray; \$1.50). Professor Mercer received from His Britannic Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Addis Abbeba a manuscript copy of the Ethiopic liturgy as it is used in Abyssinia to-day, the manuscript having been procured through His Beatitude the *Abūna*. That manuscript is here published, both in the Ethiopic and in an English translation, and gives this book a quite unique value. It is also well described and annotated by Dr. Mercer. Nor is even that all. There is a history of the Christian liturgy from the beginning, which becomes, when the fifth century is reached, a history of the Ethiopic liturgy. In short it is a volume that is quite indispensable to the student of liturgies. Much of what he finds here he will find nowhere else; and much of what he finds elsewhere he will find best here.

Undoubtedly one of the best collections of prayers is Dr. Selina Fitzherbert Fox's *A Chain of Prayer across the Ages*. Its first issue was unattractive and probably did not 'catch on.' The new edition puts that right (Murray; 2s. 6d. net). The number of prayers it contains is very great, and there are prayers in it which we have not seen anywhere else.

The Senior Course of the Standard Graded Text-Books for Teachers has been prepared by the Rev. R. H. Coats, M.A., B.D. (Pilgrim Press; 2s. net). Its subject is 'The Teaching of the Prophets.' The teachers are to be congratulated. This is the finest result of scholarship expressed in idiomatic English, set forth in attractive arrangement, and informed with a spirit of true devotion. There are scholars who would consider work of this kind beneath them; Mr. Coats lifts the work up to the level of his scholarship.

There is no end to the subjects of Mr. S. D. Gordon's 'Quiet Talks'; there is no end to the fertility of his mind. The latest book is *Quiet Talks on John's Gospel* (Revell; 2s. 6d. net). This is not the way in which the Fourth Gospel was ever expounded before. Christ is represented in His incarnation as a lover coming to woo His bride. The talks are (1) the Wooing Lover; (2) the Lover Wooing; (3) Closer Wooing; (4) the Greatest Wooing; (5) An Appointed Tryst Unexpectedly Kept; (6) Another Tryst. Into this

framework the whole Gospel seems to fit itself easily. There is a certain daring familiarity of speech, but can love be too familiar of speech?

The Rev. H. A. Wilson, M.A., has prepared a 'Manual for Confirmation Candidates and other young Churchpeople.' Its title is *The Creed of a Young Churchman* (Robert Scott; 2s. net).

The Right Rev. G. H. S. Walpole, D.D., Bishop of Edinburgh, is as courageous as well as a capable interpreter of Scripture. What has Scripture to say about the War? Not every one can answer. Dr. Walpole can answer. He has found a definite answer in our Lord's description of the fall of Jerusalem, and he applies it unflinchingly in a series of discourses which he publishes under the title of *This Time and its Interpretation* (Robert Scott; 2s. 6d. net).

A second and enlarged edition has been published of *The Return of the Lord*, by the Rev. Ernest Baker, of Johannesburg (Seeley; 3s. 6d. net).

For intelligible and reliable knowledge of Muhammadanism go to the writings of Dr. S. M. Zwemer. For the latest aspect of the whole Muhammadan question, as it is seen by an able and clear-sighted Christian missionary, go to Dr. Zwemer's latest book, *Mohammed or Christ* (Seeley; 5s. net). The book has been published opportunely. We have much before us when this war is over, and one of the greatest tasks will concern the Turk. The whole world of Islam will be on the watch. If the opportunity is unique, the difficulty will also be exceptional. Let us know at least what Islam stands for. Let us read this book carefully, prayerfully, and then go forward, not ignorant of where we are going.

One of the most useful chapters of the book gives an account of the translations of the Koran. Dr. Zwemer mentions four translations into English. Alexander Ross (1648-1688) was first. Sale came next, publishing his translation in 1734. In 1861 a new translation was made by the Rev. J. M. Rodwell. The version in the 'Sacred Books of the East' was the work of E. H. Palmer. Then there are two English translations by Moslems, one by Dr. Mohammed Abdul Hakim Khan

published in 1905; and one by Mirza Abu'l Fazl issued in 1911. There have even been attempts at a verse translation. A version in rhyme of the Chapter of the Forenoon (xciii) appeared in the *Edinburgh Review* for 1866—

I swear by the splendour of light
And by the silence of night
That the Lord shall never forsake thee
Nor in His hatred take thee;
Truly for thee shall be winning
Better than all beginning.
Soon shall the Lord console thee, grief no
longer control thee,
And fear no longer cajole thee.
Thou went an orphan boy, yet the Lord found
room for thy head,
When thy feet went astray, were they not to the
right path led?
Did He not find thee poor, yet riches around
thee spread?
Then on the orphan boy, let thy proud foot
never tread,
And never turn away the beggar who asks for
bread,
But of the Lord's bounty ever let praise be
sung and said.

The Rev. B. G. Bouchier, M.A., has published ten addresses which he delivered in 1915 while acting as chaplain to H.M. Forces. The title is taken from Kipling—*For All we Have and Are* (Skeffington). Mr. Bouchier has the right to speak to soldiers and to sufferers. With a soldier's heart he endured at the beginning of the war privations and trials such as few have had to endure even in this war. But not only has he the right, he has also the ability. The addresses are to soldiers, but they have the note of sympathy and insight which makes them acceptable to all. Is it well to have suffered? Mr. Bouchier must think it is well; for what he has learnt in suffering he can now give forth in speech.

Sir Sidney Lee, D.Litt., has issued a new edition of *A Life of William Shakespeare* (Smith, Elder & Co.; 8s. 6d. net). It has been for many years the one supreme authority for the life of the dramatist. More than that, it has been a model to all who would attempt literary biography. And now the new edition brings us into touch with the

latest knowledge, not a theory being unconsidered, however grotesque, not a footnote overlooked, however ephemeral or obscure. And even since the last edition was revised there has been quite a pile of material gathered. There is nothing to cause a revolution in our conception of the man or his work, but there is much to be incorporated in that conception. The new matter has made the new edition a much larger book than before, but that is the least part of the advantage. It is all so sifted and arranged that a clearer atmosphere surrounds Shakespeare, and we see him more clearly in it. We know his friends better; we know more about their social customs and literary ideals; we are better acquainted with the places he visited and the books he read. Many are the lives of Shakespeare, but this excels them all, both in fulness of scientific accuracy and in artistic life-likeness.

A short account of 'the things which are most surely believed among us' at the present moment has been written by the Rev. Arthur W. Robinson, D.D. The title is *Christ and the Church* (S.P.C.K.; 1s. net). Recent criticism of the New Testament has been taken fully and frankly into account. This is a sign (keeping the Publishing House in mind) not to be overlooked. It enables the earnest student of the Bible to thank God and take courage.

Why does not God stop the War? is the title which Archdeacon Basil Wilberforce gives to a small volume of sermons which has been included in the 'Purple' series (Elliot Stock; 1s 6d. net). It is the title of the first sermon. The other three are not war sermons.

The Student Christian Movement is responsible for a considerable volume on *Some Aspects of the Woman's Movement* (2s. 6d. net). The editor is Zoë Fairfield. The contributors are Ernest Barker, M.A., Fellow of New College, Oxford,

who writes on the 'History and the Position of Women'; Cecilia M. Ady, Vice-Principal of S. Hugh's College, Oxford, who writes on 'The Contribution of Women to History'; Clara E. Collet, M.A., Fellow of University College, London, who writes on 'The Movement for Intellectual Training,' and 'The Economic Emancipation of Women'; Helen Wilson, M.D., Hon. Sec. British Branch, International Abolitionist Federation, who writes on 'The Moral Revolution'; Una M. Saunders, General Secretary Y.W.C.A. of Canada, who writes on 'The International Aspect of the Woman's Movement'; William Temple, M.A., lately Headmaster of Repton School, Rector of St. James's, Piccadilly, who writes on 'The Nature of Government'; Zoë Fairfield, Assistant Secretary, Student Christian Movement, who writes on 'The Woman's Movement, the Christian Ethic, and the Individual,' and 'The Woman's Movement and the Family.' At the end there is a good working bibliography and a list of Societies of Women Workers. There is variety enough in the book, but the variety is bounded by the aims of the Student Christian Movement.

The Religious Revolution of To-day, by Professor J. T. Shotwell of Columbia University, has now been published in this country, to which it is appropriately introduced by Mr. Joseph M'Cabe (Watts; 1s. net). Revolution is a mild word. Annihilation would have been more descriptive. Professor Shotwell holds that religion is ignorance, and with the progress of science will disappear off the earth. 'We must be prepared,' he says, 'to see the higher criticism destroy the historicity of the most sacred texts of the Bible, psychology analyse the phenomena of conversion on the basis of adolescent passion, anthropology explain the genesis of the very idea of God. And where we can understand, it is a moral crime to cherish the un-understood.' All this, as we saw last month, has been refuted by one of Professor Shotwell's own colleagues.

‘Her that kept the Door.’

BY LADY W. M. RAMSAY, EDINBURGH.

To students of history the domestic customs of an ancient people must be a matter of great interest. To ordinary readers, like myself, they are certainly not the least interesting part of history. When, therefore, a short time ago, struck by the phrase quoted above (Jn 18¹⁶), I began to seek for further information on the subject, it was both disappointing and surprising to discover that in none of the commentaries on the Gospels to which I have access is to be found any reference to the fact that the doorkeeper of the high priest's palace in Jerusalem was a woman. Even Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* proved disappointing. Under the heading ‘Door, doorkeeper’ the reader is told ‘see House.’ But in the long article on ‘House’ the only reference to the doorkeeper is a brief statement that a bench was provided inside the door for the doorkeeper and servants.

Was it customary among the Jews in the time of Christ for women to be doorkeepers? In the incident related by John—in which he himself was the person who ‘spoke to her that kept the door,’—the reference is so casual as to imply that there was nothing unusual in the doorkeeper's being a woman. It may be taken for granted, however, that she was not a young woman, but one of mature age. The usages of society at the time make this quite certain. No girl or young woman could have mingled and talked freely, as this doorkeeper did, with the soldiers, officials, and general public that thronged the palace court. Besides, her position seems to have been one of responsibility, requiring judgment and considerable experience of life. She evidently had to use her own discretion as to who was to be admitted and who to be denied entrance to the palace. When John and Peter arrived together, having followed Jesus, the former, ‘who was known to the high priest’ and doubtless also to the doorkeeper, entered at once, while Peter, a fisher-lad, whose appearance may have marked him as a person more or less insignificant, and who was, at any rate, unknown, remained outside.

The word ‘maid’ used in the narrative is somewhat misleading to English readers, connected as it generally is with the idea of youth—except when qualified by the addition of the

adjective ‘old.’ In the Greek of the New Testament the word *παῖδισκη*, which is so translated, carries with it no implication of youth, although originally, no doubt, it did so, derived as it is from the word *παῖς*, ‘a child.’ The original meaning, however, had by that time disappeared, and the word had come to signify ‘a domestic female slave,’ and in the New Testament, where it occurs frequently, that is the only sense in which it is used. We have an analogous usage in our time of the word ‘boy,’ a name one meaning of which is, according to Webster's *International Dictionary*, ‘a male servant, labourer, or slave of a native or inferior race; also any man of such a race.’

In the Epistle to the Galatians (4²²⁻³¹), this same word *παῖδισκη* is translated ‘bondwoman.’ In this passage an emphatic distinction is drawn between the ‘freewoman’ and *παῖδισκη*, the ‘bondwoman.’ The son of Hagar, the ‘bondwoman,’ is not to inherit with the son of Sarah, the ‘freewoman.’ This is in the Authorized Version. In the Revised Version I note that *παῖδισκη* is translated ‘handmaid,’ which seems to me to weaken the emphasis of the statement that the writer of the Epistle makes, although the meaning remains unaltered.

In the story of the raising of the little daughter of Jairus as told by Luke (8⁴⁰⁻⁵⁶), the word ‘maid’ is used (R.V. ‘maiden’)—‘But he, taking her by the hand, called, saying, Maid, arise’—but here the Greek word is not *παῖδισκη*, but *ἡ παῖς*, ‘child.’¹ In Mk 5⁴¹ the Aramaic is given, ‘Talitha-cumi,’ ‘Damsel, I say unto thee, Arise.’ In Matthew's account the word ‘damsel’ (Greek *κοράσιον*) is used. John does not relate the incident.

Wherever in the New Testament the idea ‘young woman’ occurs, the word used is not *παῖδισκη*; and wherever *παῖδισκη* is used the meaning is, as already stated, ‘a domestic female slave.’

It is highly probable that the female slaves in Jewish households were not usually of Jewish race. They are much more likely to have been foreigners. The narrative of Peter's miraculous escape from prison (Ac 12) seems to corroborate this. When Peter reached the house of his friends and knocked at the door, ‘a damsel came to hearken, named

¹ The awkward form of the address (v. 54) shows that the Greek is a translation.

Rhoda' (R.V. 'a maid came to answer'). Rhoda is a Greek name, and the bearer of it may very probably have belonged to a Greek-speaking country. Here, again, the Greek word translated 'maid' or 'damsel' is *παιδίσκη*. Although, as already said, there is nothing in the word implying youth, yet Rhoda's action in leaving Peter standing outside the closed door while she ran back to tell that he was there seems to indicate that she was a young girl, as she is usually represented by writers on this most interesting story.

What is known of slavery among ancient peoples, including the Jews, seems to prove that the household slaves were generally treated with kindness. Such slaves, both male and female, were regarded as members of the family. They shared the family life, and they had the interest of the family and household at heart in a way that hired servants had not and were not expected to have. The most confidential business was entrusted by a master to his slaves. This friendly relation was specially the case in the Greek-speaking society of Western Asia. With the other aspects of such slavery I am not at present concerned. My object is to show that those two slave-women—the door-keeper of the high priest's palace in Jerusalem, and Rhoda, who came to answer when Peter knocked at the door of his friends' house—were trusted members of the household to which they belonged.

Domestic slavery is still customary among Mohammedans, and many instances of it have come under my own observation. I have never

known one in which the slaves were not well treated. The following incident is interesting as recalling in a way the distinction made in Galatians (quoted above) between the 'bond' and the 'free.' My husband and I had been staying for the night in the house of a wealthy peasant-landowner at a village in the interior of Asia Minor. Among the women of the household were two girls of about sixteen and eighteen respectively. The elder was particularly kind and attentive to me, doing everything possible for my comfort, and on leaving I presented her with a little ornamental box I happened to have with me, suitable for holding pins or small trinkets. As she received it the younger girl sprang forward, snatched it from her and shrieked out something which her haste and agitation prevented me from understanding. While she clutched the little box with both hands to her bosom, and the other girl stood unprotesting and making no attempt to recover her property, the mistress of the house intervened, explaining that, if a present were made, it was the right of 'the daughter of the house,' the younger girl, to have it, the elder girl being, not a daughter, but a slave. Nothing we had seen during our stay had given us any reason to suppose that one of the girls was 'free,' the other only a 'bond-woman.'

Although slavery has been abolished by modern Turkish law and the public sale of slaves abandoned many years ago, the traffic in domestic slaves, both male and female, is carried on privately, undiminished and unchecked, both in Constantinople and elsewhere.

In the Study.

Father Payne.

THE anonymous author of *Father Payne* (Smith, Elder & Co.; 7s. 6d. net) must be amused to find the reviewers identifying him with Mr. A. C. Benson. Mr. Benson must also be amused. As if there were no other in the land who could write theologico-ethical essays in a free English style! We do not believe that this is Mr. Benson. The theology is not his. And the theology is the test. A man can never, for literary ends, divest himself of his idea of God.

Father Payne was no 'religious,' but simply a

country gentleman who kept his house open for literary learners and taught them how to write. Our anonymous author adopts the device of throwing his ideas into Father Payne's mouth, and investing them with the interest of his personality. But the ideas are the author's own. Let us test him by one of the shortest of the essays, the essay on 'Beauty':—

Father Payne had been away on one of his rare journeys. He always maintained that a journey was one of the most enlivening things in the world, if it was not too often indulged in. 'It intoxicates me,' he said, 'to see new places, houses, people.'

'Why don't you travel more, then?' said some one.

'For that very reason,' said Father Payne; 'because it intoxicates me—and I am too old for that sort of self-indulgence!'

'It's a dreadful business,' he went on, 'that northern industrial country. There's a grandeur about it—the bare valleys, the steep bleak fields, the dead or dying trees, the huge factories. Those great furnaces, with tall iron cylinders and galleries, and spidery contrivances, and black pipes, and engines swinging vast burdens about, and moving wheels, are fearfully interesting and magnificent. They stand for all sorts of powers and forces; they frighten me by their strength and fierceness and submissiveness. But the land is awfully barren of beauty, and I doubt if that can be wholesome. It all fascinates me, it increases my pride, but it makes me unhappy too, because it excludes beauty so completely. Those bleak stone-walled fields of dirty grass, the lines of grey houses, are fine in their way—but one wants colour and clearness. I longed for a glimpse of elms and water-meadows, and soft-wooded pastoral hills. It produces a shrewd, strong, good-tempered race, but very little genius. There is something harsh about Northerners—they haven't enough colour.'

'But you are always saying,' said Rose, 'that we must look after form, and chance colour.'

'Yes, but that is because you are *in statu pupillari*,' said Father Payne. 'If a man begins by searching for colour and ornament and richness, he gets clotted and glutinous. Colour looks after itself—but it isn't clearness that I am afraid of, it is shrewdness—I think that is, on the whole, a low quality, but it is awfully strong! What I am afraid of, in bare laborious country like that, is that people should only think of what is comfortable and sensible. Imagination is what really matters. It is not enough to have solid emotions; one ought not to be too reasonable about emotions. The thing is to care in an unreasonable and rapturous way about beautiful things, and not to know why one cares. That is the point of things which are simply beautiful and nothing else—that you feel it isn't all capable of explanation.'

'But isn't that rather sentimental?' said Rose.

'No, no, it's just the opposite,' said Father Payne. 'Sentiment is when one understands and exaggerates an emotion; beauty isn't that—it is something mysterious and inexplicable; it makes

you bow the head and worship. Take the sort of thing you may see on the coast of Italy—a blue sea, with gray and orange cliffs falling steeply down into deep water; a gap, with a clustering village, coming down, tier by tier, to the sea's edge; fantastic castles on spires of rock, thickets and dingles running down among the clefts and out on the ledges, and perhaps a glimpse of pale, fantastic hills behind. No one could make it or design it; but every line, every blending colour, all combine to give you the sense of something marvellously and joyfully contrived, and made for the richness and sweetness of it. That is the sort of moment when I feel the overwhelming beauty and nearness of God—everything done on a vast scale, which floods mind and heart with utter happiness and wonder. Anything so overpoweringly joyful and delicious and useless as all that *must* come out of a fulness of joy. The sharp cliffs mean some old cutting and slashing, the blistering and burning of the earth; and yet those old rents have been clothed and mollified by some power that finds it worth while to do it—and it isn't done for you or me, either—there must be treasures of loveliness going on hidden for centuries in tropic forests. It's done for the sake of doing it; and we are granted a glimpse of it, just to show us perhaps that we are right to adore it, and to try in our clumsy way to make beautiful things too. That is why I envy the musician, because he creates beauty more directly than any other mind—and the best kind of poetry is of the same order.'

'But isn't there a danger in all this?' said Lestrangé. 'No, I don't want to say anything priggish,' he added, seeing a contraction of Father Payne's brows; 'I only want to say what I feel. I recognise the fascination of it as much as any one can—but isn't it, as you said about travelling, a kind of intoxication? I mean, may it not be right to interpose it, but yet not right to follow it? Isn't it a selfish thing, and doesn't it do the very thing which you often speak against—blind us to other experience, that is?'

'Yes, there is something in that,' said Father Payne. 'Of course that is always the difficulty about the artist, that he appears to live selfishly in joy—but it applies to most things. The best you can do for the world is often to turn your back upon it. Philanthropy is a beautiful thing in its way, but it must be done by people who like it—

it is useless if it is done in a grim and self-penalising way. If a man is really big enough to follow art, he had better follow it. I do not believe very much in the doctrine that service to be useful must be painful. No one doubts that Wordsworth gave more joy to humanity by living his own life than if he had been a country doctor. Of course the sad part of it is when a man follows art and does *not* succeed in giving pleasure. But you must risk that—and a real devotion to a thing gives the best chance of happiness to a man, and is perhaps, too, his best chance of giving something to others. There is no reason to think that Shakespeare was a philanthropist.'

'But does that apply to things like horse-racing or golf?' said Rose.

'No, you must not pursue comfort,' said Father Payne; 'but I don't believe in the theory that we have all got to set out to help other people. That implies that a man is aware of valuable things which he has to give away. Make friends if you can, love people if you can, but don't do it with a sense of duty. Do what is natural and beautiful and attractive to do. Make the little circle which surrounds you happy by sympathy and interest. Don't deal in advice. The only advice people take is that with which they agree. And have your own work. I think we are—many of us—afraid of enjoying work; but in any case, if we can show other people how to perceive and enjoy beauty, we have done a very great thing. The sense of beauty is growing in the world. Many people are desiring it, and religion doesn't cater for it, nor does duty cater for it. But it is the only way to make progress—and religion has got to find out how to include beauty in its programme, or it will be left stranded. Nothing but beauty ever lifted people higher—the unsensuous, inexplicable charm, which makes them ashamed of dull, ugly, greedy, quarrelsome ways. It is only by virtue of beauty that the world climbs higher—and if the world does climb higher by something which isn't obviously beautiful, it is only that we do not recognise it as beautiful. Sin and evil are signals from the unknown, of course; but they are danger signals, and we follow them with terror—but beauty is a signal too, and it is the signal made by peace and happiness and joy.'

Virginibus Puerisque.

I.

February.

THE SURPRISE OF SPRING.

'Suddenly there shone round about him a light out of heaven.'—Acts 9³.

Most boys and girls love getting surprises. A stocking hung up on the end of a bed on Christmas Eve means that the little sleeper fell asleep dreaming of a delightful surprise in the morning. And we all catch ourselves wishing for letters containing some unexpected piece of good news. Don't you feel pleased too when you suddenly meet a friend in a strange town or on a long country road? The love of surprise is born in us.

There are boys and girls, however, so spoilt by getting all sorts of good things that it is impossible for them to taste this joy at all. Poor children know it best. One of the saddest things in life is to see rich men and women spending large sums of money in the hope of being able to feel this simple joy of surprise, and all in vain. It is said that there was once a Roman emperor who offered a large fortune to the man who could procure him a new sensation—just a surprise, in fact. Of course he never got it.

Many boys and girls think that elderly people cannot understand them and their joys in the very least. It is only natural that people should change as they get older. Don't you think so? You would not like to see your father playing your games. But this love of getting a surprise does not change with years; it is one of the things that very often remain quite strong till the end of one's life.

There are grown-up people, and quite elderly people as well, who feel the joy of surprise every fresh spring morning. The other day I read a little poem about it. It is a joy that God means us to have every day, every month, and every year.

Come, sweetheart, listen, for I have a thing
Most wonderful to tell you—news of spring.

Albeit winter still is in the air,
And the earth troubled, and the branches bare,

Yet down the fields to-day I saw her pass—
The spring—her feet went shining through the
grass.

Swiftly she passed and shyly, and her fair
Young face was hidden in her cloudy hair.

She would not stay, her season is not yet,
But she has re-awakened, and has set

The sap of all the world astir, and rent
Once more the shadows of our discontent.

Triumphant news—a miracle. I sing—
The everlasting miracle of spring.¹

There is a story told of a little girl who led a very lonely life. Her friends had plenty of money—she could have good food, fine dresses, and all that sort of thing—but her mother was dead, and she had no little companions to play with. One February morning she wandered away through the grounds that surround the house where she lived, and came upon a large neglected garden all by itself. There the surprise of Spring came upon her. There had once been flower-beds in the garden. They could scarcely be distinguished now, but here and there she noticed sharp little pale green points sticking out of the dark earth. She bent very close to them and sniffed the fresh scent of the damp soil; she liked it very much. How happy she began to feel. When she went indoors she told an old nurse about the little green points and a white root like an onion that she had dug up with a sharp piece of wood. 'They're bulbs,' said the old woman; 'and bulbs are things as help themselves. That's why poor folk can afford to have them.'

After some months, the little girl had an invalid cousin—he was just about her own age—taken out to see the garden. Like many delicate boys, everything impressed him in a wonderful way. 'It's magic!' he said, when he saw the garden in its early summer beauty, 'I feel as if I want to shout out something—something thankful, joyful!' Will you believe it, when I tell you that there are men and women as old as your fathers and mothers who, every spring, feel they want to shout like that boy? They don't want to speak, just to shout, 'Spring has come—God is good!' If they try to get beyond shouting, what they say often takes away from the wonderful joy. Haven't you felt something of it? And don't you want to keep it? The birds feel it when they sing.

¹ J. Drinkwater, *Poems of Men and Hours*.

O small, wise birds, teach us to sing

To greet the Spring!

Tho' gleam it thro' a winter's sky.

Better to die

In greeting it; for doubly dies

The man whose soul is sealed against *surprise*!

People have sometimes tried to express a shout in writing. This is what one of our greatest American authors wrote to his mother about the Spring: 'I know there never was such an air, such a day, such a sky, such a God! I know it—I know it!' Mentioning some one he loved very much, he added, 'She is twin-sister to the Spring; they are both fresh and dewy, both full of hope and cheerfulness; both have bird-voices, always singing out of their hearts.'

The miracle of Spring is one of God's ways of speaking to us. 'Never thee stop in believin' in the Big Good Thing, and knowin' the world's full of it—and call it what thou likes,' the old nurse said to the invalid boy who felt that there was magic in the garden, and wanted 'to shout something thankful, joyful.'

Suddenly there shone round him a light out of heaven. That was the great surprise of Saul's life. With the light, there came the voice of Jesus, telling him that all his life he had been wronging the Friend who loved him above all others. From that day Jesus was his Master.

And in the beauty and surprise of these spring mornings Jesus speaks to you. He speaks words that I believe make you want to shout for joy. They tell of God's love. Why should you ever try to escape from it?

Let me tell you how the great light shone round about a group of men one day. One of them was walking in a picture gallery, and came upon a picture of Jesus Christ. He stood before it in a sort of reverie, half-forgetting where he was, until the picture gallery and the strangers and the quiet seriousness of the place all passed from his mind, and the man, thinking only of the picture, cried aloud, 'Bless Him! I love Him!' A man near him grasped his hand and said, 'Brother, so do I!' And a third man, and a fourth man, and a fifth man came up beside them, all strangers to each other, but drawn together by the love that conquered the world. Spring never fails to come, and it always brings with it the old, old story of God's love. Will you remember?

II.

A Bundle of Sticks.

'A bundle of sticks.'—Acts 28³.

You can all tell me what this is—a bundle of sticks such as we gather when we go for a picnic, and use for lighting a fire to make the tea. Now I wonder how many of you can tell me where a bundle of sticks is mentioned in the Bible? If you don't know, I should like you to look it up when you go home. I am going to tell you the story of it, and that will help you to know in which book to search.

St. Paul was being taken a prisoner to Rome when a terrible storm arose, and the ship was cast ashore upon the island of Malta. The passengers and crew were all saved, but the vessel was broken to pieces. Fortunately the people of the island were friendly, and when they saw the shipwrecked men shivering in their wet clothes they did a very sensible thing—they kindled a fire. But of course a kindled fire needs to be fed or it will soon go out, so Paul, the practical, set about gathering a bundle of sticks.

Now if I did not want to speak to you about the sticks themselves, we might have quite a long talk about St. Paul's common sense. He did not sit down to bemoan his misfortune. He set about at once to look for a remedy. Here were two hundred and seventy-six soaking people, and the main thing was to get them dry as soon as possible, so he must find the means to keep up the fire. And I have no doubt many of the others, when they saw him working, followed his good example. Paul had no stupid notions about things being beneath his dignity. He was not ashamed to turn his hand to anything. Whatever he did—whether it was preaching a sermon, or making tents, or gathering sticks—he did it with all his might.

Now, there are a great many different kinds of bundles of sticks. There are the neat bundles that we get from the grocer for lighting our fires, and there are the rather untidy looking bundles that we gather at picnics. There are the sticks the gardener uses to tie up his plants, and there are the bundles of brushwood with which he shields the tender seedlings from the cold spring winds.

You have sometimes heard your friends say of somebody, 'Oh, she's just a stick!' And when they say that, they don't mean anything very

complimentary. They mean that the person of whom they are speaking is stiff, and unbending, and uninteresting. Now I always think when I hear people talking that way, that they are being rather hard on the poor sticks. There is a great deal of good in sticks, so much that I should like you all to be sticks.

Let us think of some of the things that sticks do. First of all, *they light fires and help to keep them alight*. You know how cheery it is on a cold winter night to gather round a big blazing fire with a glowing log in the middle of it. Well, I think people who are kind and cheerful are just like that blazing log: they send a sort of glow about our hearts. Wouldn't you like to be this kind of stick?

But there is another thing sticks do—*they give support*, and I should like you to be this kind of stick too. I am thinking this time of the sticks the gardener uses to tie up his plants. If it were not for them, many of the frail plants would get broken and dashed to pieces by the wind. How can we be a support? By helping to bear the burden of others. Shall I tell you a splendid story of how one man bore another's burden? In the year 1780, fifty English officers were taken prisoners and confined at Seringapatam by Tippoo Sahib, Sultan of Mysore. They were treated with such cruelty that many of them died. The Sultan sent to Seringapatam fifty sets of fetters—one for each man, but amongst the men was a young officer—Captain Baird—who was so badly wounded that it would almost certainly have killed him to wear the chains. What was to be done? The Sultan had sent fifty sets, and fifty sets must be put on. Another officer named Captain Lucas came to the rescue and offered to bear his friend's load as well as his own. And for four years, in the stifling heat of that Indian prison, he wore two sets of fetters. At the end of that time the prisoners were set free.

Perhaps we haven't the opportunity to do a grand deed like Captain Lucas, but when we are kind to those who are weaker than ourselves, when we dry the tears of those who are sad, when we take care of the little ones for mother, run her messages, and are bright and obedient, we, too, are doing something to lighten the burden of another.

Once when a great ship was being launched she stuck on the ways. A small boy who was standing near laid his shoulder against the side of the huge

vessel, saying, 'I can push a pound.' That was all that was required. Swiftly the ship began to move, and soon she was floating safely on the water. You may not be able to lift a big burden, but you can all push a pound, and there is no saying what you will accomplish.

I want to speak about one more purpose for which sticks are used—*protection*. We are told that the sticks Paul gathered were brushwood, and those are just the sort of sticks the gardener uses for protecting his young plants. Sometimes he lays them on the ground in winter to keep the cold away from the roots. Sometimes he makes a kind of hedge of them to shield the tender green shoots from the cold spring winds. They stand between the weak things and the things that would hurt them. This was what the knights used to do long ago—they rode forth to defend the weak and helpless; this is what our British soldiers are still ready to do, and this is what our best British boys and girls are ready to do too. It's a fine thing to be strong, but it's a finer thing to use our strength well. Let us see to it that no small child is bullied in our presence, and that no helpless animal is ill-treated.

There is just one thing more I want you to notice. When Paul was gathering sticks he picked up a viper amongst them. The creature had made itself look so like a stick that he had not noticed it. It was numb with the cold, but the heat of the fire restored it, and, springing out, it fastened on Paul's hand. Now, what I want to say is—don't be a viper, and pretend to be a stick. Not only was the viper no use for keeping the fire alight, but it tried to do all the harm it could. Now there are some things in us that, if we don't take care, will turn us into vipers although we may appear to be good, useful sticks. There are the beginnings of envy, and malice, and selfishness, and discontent. The best thing to do is to get rid of them when they are small, and to ask Jesus to put in their place love, and kindness, and unselfishness, and thoughtfulness for others.

III.

The Wise Men.

The Rev. John Rees, Vicar of Helpringham, Lincolnshire, has published a small volume of 'Symbol Sermons to Young People and Children,' under the title of *The Finger-Post* (Beverley :

Wright & Hoggard; 3s. 6d. net). This is the Symbol Sermon on the Wise Men: 'The account of the "Wise Men" of the East reads like a most interesting story in one of your high-class fairy tale books. It so far transcends the limits of real life that it is a wonderful narrative, romantic in many of its features, and even miraculous in some of its parts.

'Here we have the strong, gaunt, manly figures of the Eastern Sages. Their long tramp over the desert wilds, the Epiphany Star shining in royal splendour in their eastern sky, their momentary check in Jerusalem, then the blazing out again of the heavenly star, and leading them on as a light to lighten the Gentiles, till it stood over Bethlehem, the destined city of Messiah's birth, then their finding of the Heavenly Prince, nay more, the New-Born King, Whom they adored and worshipped, and presented with gold and frankincense and myrrh.

'How we long to know who these wise men were, what their names were, what titles they bore, what country they came from, and what profession or vocation they belonged to. But here the Holy Scriptures are silent, a veil is drawn across, and mystery enshrouds them.

'Like a flash, or the shining meteor which led them, they appear for a brief moment before us, play their wondrous part, then vanish from our sight.

'What we do see is so praiseworthy and so noble that we would fain see more. Their courage, their endurance, their wisdom, their spiritual-mindedness are all so inspiring, so exemplary, that we well might follow them.

'In the absence of historical facts, tradition here, as elsewhere, has been busy, and assigns to them the number of three: that they were three Kings, and that they represented the three "ages" of man, viz. "Youth," "Manhood," and "Old-Age." The "Morning," "Mid-day," and "Sunset" coming to do homage to the "Bright and Morning Star," Christ Jesus.

'The country they came from is broadly described as the "East." Whether this means Persia, Chaldea, or Arabia, we cannot definitely say. But I think it was Persia, and it is very probable that they were Persian Priests, and of the Zoroastrian Religion, not idolaters, but worshippers of the true God under the emblem of fire.

'The stars and heavenly bodies would naturally

appeal to them. Then, if their country was Persia, the great Persian plains would lend themselves to the study of the stars, and from their watch-towers every heavenly light would be visible on those calm, clear, oriental nights, when the whole firmament could be swept with the glance of their eyes.

'With their crude and primitive knowledge of the stars they may have combined their knowledge of the Old Testament Scriptures, for doubtless they possessed some fragments of the Holy Writings, probably some of the writings of Isaiah and other prophets, but above all, I think, they must have been familiar with Balaam's prophecy, "That there should come a *Star* out of Jacob, and a sceptre should rise out of Israel," for they enquired, "Where is He that is born King of the Jews, for we have seen His *Star* in the East, and are come to worship Him?"

'Here they are an example to the Church, nay, to the world of mankind; the whole meaning of their search for the Saviour of men was that they might *worship* Him.

'This is another point in favour of the idea that they were not ordinary men, but men whose minds were trained to devotion and sacrifice—Priests, who recognized that any religion worthy of the name involved self-denial and oblation. Hence their "gifts" and adoration. From the very nature of their offerings, whether they understood their spiritual meaning or not, they had grasped the idea that sacrifice and devotion went hand in hand, and that He to Whom these gifts were presented was not only the King of the Jews, but the King of Heaven and Earth, the Divine One—the Sent of God.

'Let us then for a moment examine the gifts of these Eastern Sages.

'Tell me the name of these three gifts they presented when they opened their treasures? Gold, frankincense, and myrrh. Quite right.

'The first is *Gold*. A very fitting offering for a King. He was probably the only one ever born a King. Others have attained unto kingship at an early age. And so gold was offered to Him in homage as King of Heaven, and in token of His Divinity. Gold represented His Royalty, and was the fulfilment of the ancient prophecy, "To Him shall be given of the gold of Arabia." The kings of Arabia and Saba brought gifts and fell down and worshipped the true King. How these wise men knew I cannot say, but they brought those

very gifts which bare the heart and unfold the coverings of the soul in the nakedness of love and charity, and put us modern Christians to shame, in our niggardliness and paucity of sacrifice and self-denial.

'The second gift was just as full of symbolic teaching as the first. What was the name of this? *Frankincense*. Yes, and "Frankincense" means in its mystic and emblematic teaching "Worship." "We have come to worship Him," said the wise men. It was one of those materials which was burned on the altar, and the smoke which arose from it resembled the prayers of the saints, and was a sweet-smelling savour in the nostrils of the Almighty. Frankincense accompanied nearly all known religions in Divine worship; and in their gift the wise men confessed our Lord's Divine Nature, and worshipped Him as the Divine King, as Lord of Lords and King of Kings.

'The third gift was?—*Myrrh*, and myrrh betokened His "Humanity." His submission to death. It pictured forth in mystic and metaphorical language a "Body" wherein He should endure pain, suffering, and death; a body in which He should suffer the throes of sin on the Cross, the agony and bloody sweat, the griefs and stripes by which we are healed, the sorrows that should bring us joy, the "Death" that should bring us "Life."

'His Divinity, His Royalty, and Humanity were all gathered up and manifested forth in those first Epiphany gifts, which God inspired those Eastern Sages to offer to the "Saviour of Men" and the King of Heaven and Earth.'

IV.

Self-Culture.

Culture is at a discount. Is there a legitimate culture at all? Is it Christian or only pagan, and sure to end in disaster, being essentially selfish? We find a capable, responsible, restrained answer in a small volume of *School Homilies*, by Arthur Sidgwick (Sidgwick & Jackson; 3s. 6d. net). Mr. Sidgwick was Assistant Master at Rugby from 1864 to 1879. He delivered one hundred and four addresses to the boys. They are to be published now in two volumes, of which this is the first.

Mr. Sidgwick tells the Rugby boys that they owe duties to *themselves*. Two duties—self-culture

and self-respect. This is what he says on self-culture :

‘There is so much selfishness in the world of all kinds and in all relations of men ; so much the greatest hindrance to high and useful lives in the case of those who live round us is the narrow, self-centred, cold, unsympathetic instincts of the heart, that there may be a danger, in our eagerness to fill that void and shun that fault, of overlooking the duties we do owe to ourselves. And these duties are great and real, and in the teaching of Christ they are not forgotten. What we owe to others may be briefly summed up as self-forgetfulness and self-sacrifice ; what we owe to ourselves is all contained in the two words self-respect and self-culture. Of the duty of self-respect, a duty recognized before Christianity, I would speak at some other time : a few words now on the duty of self-culture.

‘It is not forgotten, I say, in the teaching of the Gospel. Full as that teaching is of self-abandonment, so that at times it seems we owe all ourselves to God, and nothing to ourselves, yet not seldom also does Christ teach us that just because our lives are not our own, just because we are bought with a price, just because ten talents or five are committed to our care, therefore it behoves us to look to our own lives all the more, and see that we employ rightly our trust, that the price is not paid in vain, that the talents do not lie idle in our hands.

‘You may think, “True, but at school at any rate this does not apply. Here we are placed where all culture is fixed for us, where our hours and work are appointed, and if we resolve to try to do our duty as laid out for us, the rest we may naturally employ at will, and we have then satisfied the demands of self-culture.”

‘I reply, No. It is true to a certain extent that your life is not here and now left so much in your hands to decide upon as it will be hereafter ; but even so it is left for you to decide very much whether you shall work well or ill ; in what ways you shall occupy your leisure ; what books you shall read ; what friends you shall cultivate ; what interests and subjects you shall give your heart to ; and, more important than all, what spirit that shall be in which you shall do all this ; and whether you begin each day with a new resolve that by God’s help you will improve to the uttermost each talent that He has bestowed upon you.

‘For, to take the lowest ground, compare for the moment the man who has done his best to improve his talents, who has availed himself of his opportunities and enlarged his interests, with the man who has gone his way and never cared for anything but the business and sports of himself and neighbours. The world in which we live, if we will only look at it, is a place of surpassing interest of all kinds, attractive to all various minds. The study of the external world, the million forms of life upon it, the picturesque tales of travel among other different manners and men and countries, the history of past nations or past great men, each with their own trials and struggles after better things, each with their own legacy of work done or truth told to us that come after, the art and the poetry and the great undying writings of various times and men—all these lie open before any one who strains to use his talents well, all these are as a sealed book to him who has left his mind untilled. The man of culture is the heir of the ages that have gone before, he learns without effort what great lives have been spent in searching ; the uncultured man is no more than a barbarian.

‘But not merely to himself is culture useful ; not even chiefly. It does not merely expand his mind and elevate his heart and increase tenfold the richness of his life ; it makes him more useful to others. Firstly, the man of culture is far less likely to be wrapped up merely in himself ; his study has made him more able to understand the desires and sorrows and needs of others. But, secondly, he is likely not only to be more willing to help ; he is certain to be more able. The difficulties of our life in this country, of course, are not diminishing as time goes on ; they are increasing. Any man who would be of real use in his generation—and who is there here who does not desire it at the bottom of his heart?—will want the full powers of which he is capable, and will find full scope for the best he can bestow.

‘And, lastly, this culture of all the faculties gives not only richness to the life ; not only does it increase the man’s power for good ; but it is expressly enjoined upon us as part of our duty here, and as one of the steps onward and upward which we are to take. Our life is not our own to do what we please with ; it is given to us by God, with all its latent powers and interests, to be developed in every way possible. If we neglect it, we are deeply responsible.

'In thinking of this, avoid two dangers.

'First, do not think your utmost is done in culture when you are content with a lower standard while a higher might be attained by effort. You can never say of any one, "*That* he might attain, but not more." Unflagging effort, here as elsewhere, not only fills the mind up according to its capacity; it enlarges that capacity. I have seen two boys start equal in everything; one by effort will reach ultimately a higher level of calibre than the other could ever after attain.

'Secondly, when you *have* done your utmost, do not be discouraged by failure. God is absolutely just; and as surely as He will demand ten talents' increase from him to whom ten talents are given, so surely will He be satisfied with a less result from less endowment. If you do your very best, it matters not a straw what your actual attainment is. You have served well your Master; you have won infinite peace for yourself; and you have enriched the world with a noble example.'

Point and Illustration.

Memories of a Publisher.

Major George Haven Putnam, Litt.D., the head of the American firm of G. P. Putnam's Sons, has written his autobiography. He has written it in two volumes, of which the second is now published, carrying the story through fifty years. The title is *Memories of a Publisher, 1865-1915* (Putnam; 9s. net).

It is more than an autobiography; it is the history of a Publishing House. Even this second volume, though it begins with the entrance of its author into the business, tells us quite as much about the firm and about men and women who were associated with it as about Major Putnam himself. Of incidents in Major Putnam's own life there were few to tell. After serving in the war, he joined his father in business in New York. On his father's death, he and his brother adopted the style of G. P. Putnam's Sons. The first ten years after the war were very trying. One is sorry to hear that it took so long for the book trade to recover. Major Putnam often visited Europe on business, and spent many days in Oxford and Cambridge as well as in London. He served his country not only in the war, but after as a citizen, and came more than once into conflict with the tribe of Tammany. His greatest service, however,

was on behalf of the law of copyright. Those are the facts. In an appendix Major Putnam publishes the letters which he has written to the newspapers since the present war began.

Now let us see through his eyes some of the men he has come in contact with.

Channing. — 'Frothingham related to me an incident that his father had told him in regard to the beginning of the Channingite movement against the Calvinistic control of the Congregational churches. In response to an appeal issued by Mr. Channing, the ministers of the Congregational churches of Boston and the adjacent territory who were in sympathy with Channing's protest against the Calvinistic creed, had come together in Channing's church in Boston to formulate a platform. The hour came for the meeting, but Channing, the leader, had not appeared. Nathaniel Frothingham, as his neighbour and nearest friend, was sent to Channing's house to ascertain the difficulty. He found the divine wrapped up in flannels and with his feet in a tub of hot water. "Ah! Brother Frothingham," said Channing, "I am sadly disappointed to be a delinquent, but our friends will have to get on without me. I am disabled with an attack of neuralgia. This bitter east wind has been too much for me." "East wind!" replied Frothingham, "why, the wind is from the south-west and the air is balmy and warm." Channing looked out sadly through his window to a neighbouring vane which surely enough, as pointed, marked the wind from the east. "Oh, Brother Channing," said Frothingham, "that vane is untrustworthy; it is on a Baptist chapel, and it has in some way become fixed." The instant Channing learned that the wind was not from the east, his neuralgia disappeared. He threw off his flannels, got into his boots, and hurrying down to the church on the arm of his friend, he opened the meeting with an address that became famous in the history of the intellectual life and of the theological development of New England and of the country.'

Tyrrell.—Major Putnam speaks of his intercourse with Père Hyacinthe, and then says: 'Forty years later, I came into personal relations with another faithful son of the Church, an earnest Christian who had by honest thinking brought himself within the pale of heresy, Father Tyrrell.

It was impossible for Father Tyrrell, even after his excommunication, to believe that he had been put out of the Church. He took the ground that the Holy Father had been badly advised and was not in a position to realize the honesty of purpose of the so-called Modernists. I found Tyrrell in a little attic not far from the noise of Clapham Junction Station. In being put out of the Church, he had, of course, lost all opportunity of employment even as a teacher. He would have found serious difficulty in securing even his daily bread if it had not been for the friendly liberality of his publishers, the Longmans. I could not but be impressed at the pathos of the man's position.'

R. L. Stevenson.—'I happened to be in London in a winter month, probably December. I remember that, while the thermometer was not low, the air had that peculiar heat-absorbing capacity which an American, coming into the damp winter climate of London, finds so exacting. The Savile house, like most buildings of its age in London, had no means of being heated other than by the open fire-places. When the room was free, the Yankee took the opportunity of the closest possible contact with this fire-place. On the evening in question, I found in going up after dinner into the general gathering room, that the fire-place was practically occupied by a tall Scotchman. I knew at once that he was a Scotchman by his accent, and his dress presented a rather exaggerated Scotch tweed effect. I was struck also by the fact that, in distinction from the usual evening dress of the British gentleman, the fire-absorbing interloper had held on to a flannel travelling shirt. The general impression of roughness gave me the idea of affectation. I found that my man was relating to three or four club members, who assisted him in blocking the fire from the Yankee, some recent experiences in the mountains of the Cevennes, where he had had a donkey for a travelling companion. He had been in London for a week or more but he was still taking pains to carry the appearance of a traveller who had had a rough experience. He spoke with great affection of the donkey, who for chumming purposes was, he contended, worth any dozen men. The little pictures that he gave in his talk of the valleys and of the inhabitants of the Cevennes were certainly dramatic and sufficiently interesting to listen to, and made me almost forget my griev-

ance in having the narrator's tweed between me and the heat. I had, of course, no idea that I was looking at and listening to a great man or at least a man who was going to become great. If it were only possible in going through the forest to know in advance which of the little trees years later were to become the big trees, life would be much more interesting, while the success of a publisher would be assured.'

Kitchener.—'I had the opportunity, in crossing the Atlantic in the spring of 1910, of securing a personal impression of Lord Kitchener, who was at the time on his way to London after an absence from England of seven years. We were fellow-passengers on the White Star steamer *Oceanic*, and, having had previous trips with Captain Haddock, I was placed at his table opposite to his most distinguished guest. Kitchener was at this time about sixty years of age. He had been in command of the army in India, and had come into conflict with the Viceroy, Lord Curzon, in regard to the relation of the civil authority to the control of the army and to the management of problems and frictions arising on the frontier.

'My first impression of the General was not entirely favourable. The figure was tall and the bearing erect and soldierly. The head was sturdy and rather bullet-shaped and the forehead was low. There was a slight divergence in the eyes, resulting in a sinister expression which doubtless did injustice to the nature of the man. The general impression given by the face was, however, not only autocratic but suggestive of a capacity for bad temper. One felt that the General would be a bad man to "come up against" in a matter of discipline or even of opinion. He had gained the reputation of being a great organizer and a stern and exacting disciplinarian. He was also noted for his aversion to titled or labelled incapacity and to "flummery" of all kinds. He was for the great part of the time reticent, having no small talk and expressing no interest in the general subjects that came up from day to day. In fact, while the ladies remained at table (we had two in a party of eight) Kitchener hardly opened his lips. I remembered having been told that he was a confirmed misogynist, and that he made it a practice to refuse to place any special responsibility in the hands of a married officer if a bachelor were within reach. He took the ground that the influence or even the

existence of a wife was likely to be demoralizing on the capacity either for working or for fighting.'

The Healing of Prayer.

The Rev. W. Mackintosh Mackay, B.D., of Sherbrooke Church, Glasgow, is a preacher. Every sermon in the new volume *Words of this Life* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s.) says so. The idea and its divisions are there before a word is written down. It is a living idea; and there is life in every part of it. No nervous anxiety is felt for the text. When it is not deliberately expounded it is illustrated, and the illustration becomes exposition. Sometimes it is discovered to be other than the expositor imagined. 'I sat where they sat' (Ezk 3¹⁵) is 'A Scholar in Sympathy'; 'He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one' (Lk 22⁸⁶) is 'The Cost of Christ's Sword'; 'If thou take forth the precious from the vile, thou shalt be as my mouth' (Jer 15¹⁹) is 'Taking the Gold out of Life.' The illustrations are not too many and they are right. This is an oft-quoted word on Prayer: it cannot be quoted too often—

'At a meeting of the British Medical Association Dr. Hyslop, the superintendent of the Bethlem Hospital for Mental Diseases, said: "As one whose whole life has been concerned with the sufferings of the mind, I give it as my experience that of all the hygienic measures to counteract disturbed sleep, depressed spirits, and all the miserable results of a mind diseased, I would undoubtedly give the first place to prayer. Let there be a habit of nightly communion with God, not as a mere mendicant or repeater of the words of others, but as an individual who submerges his personality in the greater whole, and such a habit will do more to clean the mind and strengthen the soul than any other therapeutic agent known to me."'

The Wind on the Heath.

The Rev. G. H. Morrison, D.D., has published another volume of Sunday Evening Addresses, with the title of *The Wind on the Heath* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s.). The title is taken from *Lavengro*; we are not sure that we see its relevance, but the addresses are as divinely human as ever. Divinely human, for human

nature is amply recognized (hence the interest); and its helplessness apart from divine grace is just as forcibly declared (hence the power).

The subject of one sermon is the Contentment of Love. Dr. Morrison uses this illustration: 'I have a dear friend who, when she was a girl, used to collect for charities in Ayrshire. And one of the cottages she had to visit was that of a pious and reverent old woman. Betty was in very straitened circumstances, so much so that no one knew how she existed, yet would she have been mightily insulted if the collector had dared to pass her door. One day, when the collector visited the cottage, Betty was sitting at her tea. And as she rose to get her widow's mite out of the chest, she threw her apron hastily across the tea-table. Whereon the girl, in girlish curiosity, lifted the apron to see what it concealed, and found that the hidden cup was filled with water. "Why, Betty," she cried in her astonishment, "it isn't tea you've got here, it is water." "Ay, my dear," said Betty, "it's just water, but *He makes it taste like wine.*" Better a cup of water where love is, than choicest vintage of the grape without it. "Better a dinner of herbs where love is, than a stalled ox where there is hatred." Nor is there any love of man so deep and broad, so perfect in its power and in its tenderness, as the love of God that is commended to us in the death of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.'

The Padre.

The Rev. J. Esslemont Adams, B.D., of the West United Free Church in Aberdeen, has had his share of the experiences that go to the making of war. What they are he tells us in *The Chaplain and the War* (T. & T. Clark; 6d. net), a vividly written and realistic picture of the things the messenger of peace has to do and be when a great war comes. The illustrations make the book (a marvel for the money) much more interesting than the following quotation will be without them:

'Most chaplains hope sooner or later to be posted to duty at the front. There, in the rattle of rifle fire and the roar of artillery, they feel the thrill of battle and taste the stern reality of war. Every village and farm and wayside cottage is full of combatants, and houses partly wrecked by shell fire are not despised as billets. With a roof for cover and a floor for bed, the British soldier "keeps smiling" and is thankful for his daily mercies.

The chaplain's life in such an area is crowded with interest. If he is attached to a battalion, he probably stays at headquarters with the Commanding Officer, the Adjutant, the Doctor, and one or two of the senior officers. If he is the right man, the chances are that he is not only a minister of the gospel but major-domo as well! He is made mess president, buys the mess luxuries, arranges the menus, and sees that hot water is ready for those coming "home" from the trenches. If the prunes are badly stewed, or the lamps badly trimmed, or the precenting badly performed, or the sermon badly preached, he is promptly "told off." He is all things to all men, and has innumerable opportunities of friendship with all ranks as he goes from billet to billet, visiting the companies housed in each. He easily wins affection and confidences. He carries in his valise all sorts of wonderful things given him for safe-keeping, from the Colonel's will to the youngest subaltern's love letters. He has one man's signet-ring, another's cap badge, a third's skean-dhu. When the battalion moves up to the trenches he may go with it or he may not. In the summer-time, when the spell in the trenches may extend for weeks, he has a good excuse for making his home in a dug-out; but in the bitter winter months, when the men are in the trenches only for a few days at a time, his orders are to remain with those left in billets. The staff who look after these billets, the transport section, who go up every night with supplies of food and ammunition for the firing line and come back weary and very late, are then his parish proper. Frequently a message comes from the front asking for the Padre, and straightway he calls for his horse and rides forward. A few hundred yards from the trenches he finds the Reserves in some hardly recognizable ruin, once a farm, or an inn, or a church. Hiding his horse in the safest place in a region where no one and no thing is safe, he sits for a while with the men in their so-called shelters, playfully christened "Shell View," "Buckingham Palace," "Wait-and-See House," and gets all the news. Then, ascertaining for what he is needed, he goes on to his appointed task. Sometimes this takes him into the trenches. These are not easy to promenade in, the mud is deep and the space narrow, but with pictures from magazines, photographs, verses of poetry, and texts of Scripture stuck upon the walls, these dreary drains where human beings keep vigil day and night

are made as ornamental and cheerful as possible. A lad is sick; or one is slain, and there is to be a trench burial. But the chaplain may not have to go into the trenches. When possible, the body is brought out under cover of darkness and placed in the Aid Post three or four hundred yards behind the trenches. Close by, the corner of a field or of an orchard has been reserved as a little cemetery. Wrapped in a blanket, the soldier's body is borne forth by a party of his comrades. A simple service is read, the 23rd Psalm and one or two verses of New Testament Scripture, and a short prayer is offered. Then the wail of the pipes playing "The Flowers of the Forest," or the clear note of the bugle sounding the "Last Post," carries the tidings to all that a gallant comrade has been laid to his rest.

A Painter of Dreams.

A Painter of Dreams and other Biographical Studies (Lane; 12s. 6d. net) is the title which A. M. W. Stirling has given to a volume of biographical gossip. Now gossip, like patriotism, may be good or bad. Time was when the word patriotism was never used without a qualifying adjective. The adjective was always favourable—"good," "honest," or the like. Gossip without an adjective should be considered good; and "malicious" should be prefixed if it is bad.

So this is gossip. The persons are often great—Wellington, Watts, the Earl of Albemarle, and the like—but the things that they say and do are little, just the ordinary things of everyday life. Hence the interest.

The first biographical study consists of extracts from a Georgian Scrap-book. The diarist is Diana Bosville, a woman of wit and learning. She was the friend of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, and was described by the surly Dr. Johnson as 'A mighty intelligent lady.' Here is one of the extracts:

'A Cluster [of grapes] was cut at Welbeck by His Grace the Duke of Portland, and presented to the Marquis of Rockingham. It was conveyed to Wentworth House by four Labourers, and weighed nineteen Pounds and a half. Its greatest Diameter when hanging in its natural position was 19 inches and a half. Its Circumference four Feet and a half, and its Length 21 Inches and three quarters.

'This Account is strictly true, and was well known to many of the Nobility and Gentry and all the then Domestics of those two Noble Families.

'See that extraordinary Grape also mentioned in Holy Writ, Numbers, chap. 13, v. 23.

'*This Account appeared in all the Newspapers in the Month of Sept. 1781.*'

The Painter of Dreams is Roddam Spencer Stanhope, the friend of Watts. His career is sketched with a light hand, and some of his letters are quoted. 'Last Saturday,' he says, 'I went down to Brighton. What a horrid place it is for extempore preachers. The description I heard of

one was, "He is not much of a *Theologian*, but the most *brilliant orator* I ever heard. It is quite an *intellectual treat* to go to hear him!" Heaven preserve me from going to church for an "intellectual treat"! I would sooner stop at home for a raspberry-jam one!'

It was a young man who said this. And this also: 'The Pre-Raphaelites give such accounts of Ruskin. He seems to be the most prejudiced, arbitrary, cantankerous fellow, and I shall keep as clear as I can of him.'

Enough. The book has rescued some personalities from oblivion. It will give its readers a few hours' pleasant reading, as pleasant as a good novel would give and quite as profitable.

The Sun Song of Iceland.

BY THE REV. JOHN BEVERIDGE, B.D., FOSSOWAY.

ONE of the most characteristic of the literary remains of the Northern Christian spirit is the Sun Song (*Solarljöd*), an Icelandic poem dating from the beginning of the thirteenth century and preserved in its original form. The song is far simpler than most of the productions that have come down to us from dim antiquity. It belongs to the more obscure works of Middle Age poetry—for its skald or author shows affection for a symbolism which, at least in our day, is not easy to understand. The Sun Song is strongly personal in mood and expression, and it differs considerably from the religious historical poems which date from the same period; and a vision of heaven and of hell occupies an important part of the song.

Visions from the realms of salvation and perdition were common in the Middle Ages, but they were generally handed down in prose form. Dante's *Divina Commedia*, however, the most classic work in the wide field of vision literature, is a poem, and the Sun Song has something in common with Dante's immortal work. The poems belong to Roman Catholic Europe, even if original local images are found mingled with the original foreign. It is the new spirit, the spirit of Christianity that created and upheld them.

The Sun Song is supposed to be sung by a dead man, who appears to his son and begs him to take the song and make it known among the living.

The dead man tells of his life on earth, of his death, of the journey of the soul through hell and heaven; and at last he speaks of man's 'day of gladness' when father and son will meet again. That day of eternal joy, *dies lætitiæ*, dawns after the judgment day, *dies iræ*. The father warns the son against the delusions and errors of this present world. It is not riches and it is not health that give happiness, for they are of to-day and to-morrow they are no more. Lust, which takes possession of the thought-life, clings to love like a disease, and brings sin and sorrow with it. Power and pride give no lasting joy, for they seduce one from what is good. Even friendly words are unstable ground to build on, for deceit may easily hide itself under them. God is the true riches, the true love and power, the true friend—according to the skald—and he begs his son to seek the Lord and His kingdom.

The father then proceeds to give an account of his death and of the experiences that await beyond the veil of mortality. He speaks of his fear of death, how day after day his looks turned to the sun as if it could afford some help. 'Mighty it seemed in many ways compared with that which was before.' And in his fever fantasies the sun becomes 'God Most High' before whom he bows in reverence,—evidently just the current idea of the sun as the symbol of God.

The hell which the Sun Song depicts is that with which we are familiar from the Middle Ages; that every sin has its exactly corresponding punishment. They who had gold for their god bear loads of lead in the world of woe. The hands which broke the peace of Sundays and saint days are nailed to hot stones. Adders gnaw through the breasts of the men who once drove the sword through the hearts of other men. But on the whole the picture of the tortures of the wicked pales before the riotous inventiveness of some of the contemporary vision literature of more southern lands.

But the description of the felicity of the blessed in heaven is affecting in its simplicity, quietness, and beauty. 'Next I saw men who had yielded obedience to the laws of God; pure light shone brightly round their heads. Next I saw men who had generously helped the poor; the angels read holy books and heavenly scripture over them. After that I saw men who had greatly mortified the flesh by fasting; the angels of God bowed before them, and that is the highest joy. Next I saw men who had supplied their mother's mouth with food; they rested softly on the beams of heaven.' And then, with a fervent appeal for the Creator's grace towards His creature, the section ends thus:

'Almighty Father, glorious Son, Holy Spirit of heaven, Thou who hast created us, I pray Thee for salvation for us all in our need.' And the poem closes with the dead man's farewell to his son. 'Here we two part, to meet again on men's day of gladness. My Lord, grant peace to the dead, and healing to them who live!'

The loving thought for others which appears in these passages is by no means confined to the Sun Song. The Song has background enough in the contemporary Northern literature. How full of mindfulness, for instance, is the old Church prayer which has come down to us from these early centuries:

'Let us pray, good brethren, to God our Almighty Father, that He may purge the world from all its errors, take sickness away from the sick, and hunger from the famishing. May He open the prisons and deliver them that are bound: may He grant to travellers a safe journey home, and give seafarers a good haven, and vouchsafe healing to them that are wounded.'

But the whole Sun Song is not so simple and clear. Here and there are verses influenced by European symbolism of the obscure order. Here

is a verse which is symbolical. 'Now have I, your father, along with Solkatla's sons, described to you, my son, the horn of the hart which the wise Vigdvalin brought out of the barrow.' Solkatla means the sun-vessel, and personifies the heavenly Jerusalem which is filled with the light of God, the eternal sun. Solkatla's sons are the saints who dwell in God's celestial city of light. From them the dead father has learned lessons which he now sends further. He has described 'the horn of the hart' to his son. The hart, in the symbolism of the Middle Ages, was an image of Christ, and its horn was the divinity of Christ. The horn of the hart, the divinity of Christ, of which the deceased has spoken, the wise Vigdvalin brought out of the barrow. Vigdvalin means the one who fights slumbering, and is a name for Christ, whose body slumbered in the grave whilst His spirit went down to hell and fought with the devil. This battle-slumberer brought his divine power out of the barrow, the grave, when he arose from the dead. Because that is what the Song has described it is called *Solarljod*, the Song about the Sun, the true Sun, the divine.

Although *Solarljod* has not been translated into English, so far as we know, or found any interpreters among us, yet the Sun Song has a considerable literature, especially in Icelandic, Norse, and Danish. The sources from which we have drawn most freely for this article are Finnur Jónsson's *Skjaldedigtning* and Fredrik Paasche's *Kristendom og Kvad*. From these we learn that the author of the Sun Song is unknown. The number of MSS is considerable, but not one is earlier than the seventeenth century. Some of them refer in marginal notes to much earlier copies, and one at least specifies a vellum MS. The versification and style carry us back to the Edda Age. The poem is distinctly epical. Its pictorial language, its dualistic view of life, and its ethic, flow through a channel of action and a fulness of narrative that do not cease until the very last verse is reached. The Song depicts men from life; and this epic feature and its multitudinous fantasy give to *Solarljod* a characteristic stamp. The various concrete images sometimes cover deep spiritual conceptions which invade the picture and volatilize it. And the personal mood pervading the Song is indicative of a soul-peace acquired through stern struggle, and reveals a fervent longing to know the secret things of God. From the

historic point of view the Sun Song is of importance; for it testifies to the character and extent of Christian influence in the North at the beginning of the thirteenth century. The skald introduces the symbolism of the Church with freedom and

aptness; and the whole Song presupposes the religious development which Iceland, as we know from other sources, had attained at that age. There is no European Vision Song which can have been the prototype of *Solarljod*.

Is the Fourth Gospel a Literary Unity?

BY THE REV. R. H. STRACHAN, M.A., B.A., CAMBRIDGE.

II. THE CHRONOLOGICAL PLAN.

THE ideal plan, outlined in the previous article, can be verified by a careful study of the Gospel. The Gospel as it stands is also set in a chronological framework, in which certain minor topographical details are also embedded. Some of these are very vague and obscure (*e.g.* Ephraim, 11⁵⁴). The suggestion is, that this chronological framework has been superimposed on the original Gospel with its ideal division, by the hand of an editor (R), whose main purpose is to produce a uniform movement of events. It is impossible to suppose that the Gospel could have been constructed from two different points of view—an ideal and a strictly chronological—by the same hand, unless on the hypothesis that the author had no first-hand knowledge. Of course, certain of the chronological and topographical details (*e.g.* 4⁶ 11¹⁸) are evidently spontaneous and natural, and stand in no contradiction to the ideal scheme. Many, however, are irreconcilable. For example, the Cleansing of the Temple cannot possibly have taken place at a very short interval after the opening 'sign' of the ministry. In point of fact, the position which this incident occupies in the Gospel is a key, as has been pointed out, to the problem of dual authorship.

We may now proceed to the examination of certain passages that apparently belong to the chronological scheme:

- 2¹. The repeated statements—*τῇ ἐπαύριον*—in 1²⁹. 35. 43 need not be questioned. They indicate quite naturally three days in the early friendship of the disciples with Jesus. The expression, *καὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ* (2¹) strikes us as, strange. What is the meaning of 'on the third day'? It naturally means

'three days after' the last of the three days mentioned previously (*cf.* Mt 20¹⁹, Lk 18³³), and is probably intended to collect the events into one week, at the opening of the ministry. Two considerations lead to the conclusion that this chronological detail is out of place: (1) The fact that the disciples of Jesus are bidden to the wedding, and yet at the time of the invitation they could not have met Him. (2) That even three days is not sufficient save for a very hurried journey, from the rather mysterious locality mentioned in 1²⁸, where the call of the disciples took place (*cf.* Spitta, *Das Johannes - Evangelium*, p. 64).

- 2¹². In v. 12 an interval in Capernaum is mentioned of 'not many days.' The statement is very vague, and is evidently intended to fill up the time until the Passover mentioned in v. 13 is due. The mention of Capernaum is probably suggested by 4⁴⁶. The *μετὰ τοῦτο* (like the frequent *μετὰ ταῦτα*) is also extremely vague, and rather at variance with the exactness of other passages in the Gospel where time and place are mentioned. The introduction of *οἱ ἀδελφοί* is also strange, inasmuch as they play no part in the Gospel until 7^{3ff.}.

- 2²³⁻²⁵. Another passage that seems to belong to R is 2²³⁻²⁵. It is evidently intended to introduce the story of Nicodemus, and to link it up with the preceding

Passover occasion. It is apparent that the story of Nicodemus presupposes a ministry of considerable length, and a popular movement that already had time to make itself felt in ecclesiastical circles (3^{2.11}). It is quite unlikely that this should be the result of one brief visit to Jerusalem. Both the Cleansing of the Temple and the visit of Nicodemus belong chronologically to a much later stage in the ministry.

Moreover, there are one or two points in the language of 2²⁸⁻²⁵ that are remarkable:—

1. V.²⁸ is the only occasion in the Gospel when belief *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ* is regarded as equivalent to an inferior kind of belief based on *σημεῖα*.

In 1¹² 3¹⁸ 20³¹, the phrase indicates the highest kind of faith.

2. Nowhere else in the Johannine writings, and only in Lk 16¹¹, Ro 3², 1 Co 9¹⁷, Gal 2⁷, 1 Th 2⁴, Tit 1³ in the N.T. is *πιστεύω* used in the sense of 'entrust.'

3. Also the play upon words is nowhere characteristic of the Johannine style, unless 11¹² is regarded as such. But *κεκοίμηται* (= 'sleep') is only an instance of misunderstanding of Jesus' words (cf. 3⁴), and quite in Johannine style.

4. *μαρτυρέω* is only once used elsewhere in the Johannine writings of witness borne to man (3 Jn 12). Otherwise it always indicates witness to the Person of Jesus Christ.

- 3²². *μετὰ ταῦτα* is one of the somewhat vague expressions of time used by R to connect the Johannine material (cf. *μετὰ τοῦτο* in 2¹²). The original opening would probably be *ἦλθεν δέ ὁ Ἰησοῦς* (cf. 3¹). The simultaneousness of the activity of John and of Jesus is part of the essential argument in the earlier part of the Gospel in connexion with the Baptist controversy, namely, that Jesus did not merely take up the work of the Baptist, where he left off, and clearly belongs to J.

- 4¹⁻³. There are several linguistic and grammatical peculiarities in these verses.

1. The use of *ὁ Κύριος* as a proper name, as in 6²⁸ 11² 20^{2. 18. 21. 25}. These

passages on this and other grounds may be assigned to R. The word is frequently used in the Fourth Gospel as a title of courtesy addressed to Jesus, and in the vocative. J. Weiss in his recently published *Kyrios Christos* has laid emphasis on the fact that *Kύριος* as a religious title of Jesus Christ is found in the N.T. alongside a semi-mystical usage of *Χρίστος*, which tends somewhat to 'de-personalize' the idea of the Risen Jesus, and to identify Him in Christian experience with the Spirit. 'The Lord is the Spirit' (2 Co 3¹⁷; cf. ib. *Urchristenthum*, pp. 330 f.). The 'indwelling Christ,' and being 'in Christ,' are the watchwords of a more advanced stage of Christian experience, in which the earlier eschatological point of view gradually gave place to an inward and present relationship with the Risen Jesus. This development reaches its climax in the Johannine conception of the Christ 'abiding in us,' and of the spirit as the *alter ego* of Jesus. *ὁ Κύριος* as applied to Jesus is probably directly borrowed from the LXX as a title of God. The mere presence of the word in itself would be rather slender ground on which to assign any particular passage in the Fourth Gospel to R; but it is remarkable that it occurs as a divine title only in those passages (4¹ 6²⁸) which may on other grounds be so assigned, and in 21^{7. 12}. In that case R would represent, as he undoubtedly does, a somewhat earlier stage of N.T. thought than the Johannine. The *Kύριος* conception of the Risen Jesus, which involves a religious relationship, paralleled by that of master and slave, has no place in the Johannine thought. 'Henceforth I call you not slaves, but friends.' R, it may be conjectured, is a conservative of a later age, who clings to older forms of thought like *Kύριος*. He seeks to give more place to the Galilean

ministry and, by building up in a chronological frame work the Johannine material, to make the ideal presentation conform more closely to the traditional conception of a 'gospel,' after the Synoptic pattern.

2. The involved nature of the sentence in v.⁴ is remarkable. It is possible that it is the result of a combination of the Johannine material and R's editing. Spitta's suggestion may very well be adopted, namely, that *Ἰησοῦς* should be transferred to the place of *ὁ Κύριος*, and that the clauses *ὅτι ἤκουσαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι*, and *καίτοιγε . . . μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ* should be regarded as belonging to R (*Das Johannes-Evangelium*, p. 91). 'When then Jesus knew that he was making and baptizing more disciples than John, he left Judea, and went away again into Galilee.'

The mention of the Pharisees is quite unexpected. The real point of connexion with what precedes is the apparent rivalry between the Baptist and Jesus. In vv.²⁸⁻³⁰, the Baptist reiterates the declaration that he is not the Messiah. 'He must increase, but I must decrease' (v.³⁰). Jesus is represented, in accordance with the Johannine purpose, as intentionally avoiding any semblance of rivalry with the Baptist. R evidently regards His departure from Judea as due to a desire to escape from the impression made on the Pharisees, the leaders of the popular party, by the fact that He was making more disciples than the Baptist. Jesus again seeks to escape from popularity (cf. 6¹⁵).

3. The exact significance of the parenthetic clause (v.²) is obscure. In any case it is well-nigh impossible to suppose that a writer who has already three times (3²², 26 4¹) asserted that Jesus was 'baptizing,' should only now contradict himself.
4. As grammatical points there may be noted:

- (1) That *καίτοιγε* is a *hapax legomenon* in the N.T.

- (2) The characteristic use of *αὐτὸς* = 'of Himself,' as though He consciously put Himself in opposition to the Baptist. Cf. the similar use in 2²⁴, 25 4⁴⁴ 6⁶ 7¹⁰. R is more than ordinarily jealous for the complete 'autonomy' of Jesus. In the Johannine thought, Jesus' 'autonomy' is always consistent with a complete dependence on the will of God (4³⁴ 5³⁰ etc.). In the real Johannine thought, autonomy and subordination are set side by side in the consciousness of Jesus. His hour for action strikes only when the will of the Father is clear. Yet He lays down His life 'of Himself.' The rebuke in 2⁴, and the two delays (7⁹ 11⁶) are due to this reason.

- 4^{43-46a}. 1. The most remarkable utterance in 4⁴³⁻⁴⁶ is the use made of the saying of Jesus in v.⁴⁴. It seems to imply that Judea, and not Galilee, is the *πατρίς* of Jesus. Attempts have been made to explain it by saying that Jesus seeks Galilee for quiet. He did not expect or desire the reception given Him by the 'Galileans' (v.⁴⁵). Yet the meaning seems obvious that there is a contrast intended between the coldness of Judea,—and not only the Samaritan reception but also His popularity in Galilee. If R has thus misunderstood the saying, he has also misunderstood the significance of the preponderance given in the Johannine material to the ministry in Judea. The mention also of Cana in Galilee is superfluous, except for the necessity of drawing attention to the former miracle wrought there. R in v.⁵⁴, founding on 2¹¹, emphasizes that this is the second miracle wrought in Galilee, true to his plan of giving a more prominent place to the Galilean ministry.

2. Certain grammatical and linguistic points are of interest.

(1) ἐδέξαντο is not used elsewhere in Johannine writings. The Johannine word is λαμβάνω (1¹²). It is used in a similar spiritual sense in Mk 9³⁷, Mt 10⁴⁰, Lk 9⁴⁸.

(2) The causal participle ἐωρακότες is not found in the Johannine writing except in 2²³ 21¹². κεκοπιακώς in 4⁶ is not a parallel. The emphasis is on the state, rather than on the causal connexion. The most frequent Johannine use is with ὅτι (e.g. 10⁵).

(3) καὶ αὐτὸς γάρ is a unique order in N.T. Nowhere else is καὶ thus separated from γάρ.

(4) 5¹ is the only instance in the Gospel where the feast in question is not named.

61. 2. 6. 1. 61. 2 have clearly an affinity with Mt 15²⁹⁻³¹. It is not at all clear why they should be inserted here, unless it be to explain the presence of the crowd that has gathered mysteriously, it is not said from whence (v.⁵). The mysterious appearance and disappearance of individuals and of the multitude is quite in the Johannine style. The reason can only be that the Evangelist is presupposing a knowledge of the history, which he is idealizing, on the part of his readers. There is therefore no need of such statements as those in vv.^{1. 2}.

2. Certain linguistic and grammatical points are worthy of note in these verses.

(1) The addition of τῆς Τιβεριάδος after Γαλιλαίας in v.¹ is remarkable (cf. 6²³ 21¹).

(2) If the reading ἐώρων in v.² is to be adopted, we have the only instance of the imperfect of this verb in the Johannine writings. Only the future

ὄψομαι and the perfect ἑώρακα are found.

(3) In v.⁶ πειράζων is a *hapax legomenon* in the Johannine literature.

(4) Note also the use of αὐτός; see under 4¹⁻³ (4).

61⁵. 1. The ascription of this verse to R is made chiefly on the general ground that, as in other R passages, the withdrawal of Jesus is attributed to His desire to escape popularity as a political Messiah. The same idea occurs in other R passages. For example, in 4^{1st}, the escape is effected in order to avoid the impression made on the Pharisees, the leaders of the popular party, by the fact that His disciples were becoming more numerous than the Baptist's. In the Fourth Gospel there is no *Messiasgeheimnis* idea, save in the R passages. Jesus is acknowledged as Messiah openly, as by the first disciples, and He makes Himself known as Messiah to the Samaritan woman. The reason is that in the Fourth Gospel Jesus is confessedly more than Messiah. He is Son of God, and the Saviour of the world. The imminence of the Cross and the nature of His Person take the place of the Messianic secret, and produce the sharp conflict of belief and unbelief. The Twelve are represented as staunch in spite of a clear announcement of His approaching death on the Cross, with the exception of Judas (66⁷⁻⁶⁹). Simon Peter does not seek to turn Jesus from the Cross, as in the Synoptic story. Not he, but Judas is called διάβολος (67⁰).

2. As regards the style of this verse, we may note:—

(1) ἀνεχώρησεν is a *hapax legomenon* in the Johannine writings (cf. Mk 3⁷, Mt 12¹⁵).

- (2) *πάλιν*, if it is genuine, is difficult to account for, as the previous miracle is regarded as taking place in the 'mountain' or hill-country itself, and no mention is made of Jesus' departure from it (cf. v.³). The disciples also, in v.¹⁶, 'go down to the sea' (*κατέβησαν*).

- (3) *αὐτὸς μόνος* occurs only in 12²⁴, and in Mk 6⁴⁷, of which it is probably an echo.

6²³. 6²³ is to be referred to R, from *ἐγγὺς . . . τοῦ Κυρίου*, on linguistic grounds. For the occurrence of *ὁ Κύριος* as a proper name, see under 4¹⁻³ (1). There is also the word *εὐχαριστήσαντος*. It has in this verse no sacramentarian reference, but is related to the use of the same word in v.¹¹, where the sacramentarian sense is pronounced. Also the expression *ἔφαγον τὸν ἄρτον* is not found elsewhere in the Gospel. *φάγειν ἐκ* (6⁵¹) is used, or the accusative with *τρώγω* (6⁵⁸).

7¹. The usual *μετὰ ταῦτα* is inserted as a connecting link. The sentence probably began in the original Johannine document *περιπατεῖ δὲ* (cf. 6², *ἀνῆλθεν δὲ*).

7¹⁰. 1. This verse is an attempt to explain the apparent indecision on the part of Jesus, and to preserve His consistency of action. The reading *οὕτω* in v.⁸ is already an indication of the difficulties that presented themselves to subsequent copiers of the MS., on account of v.¹⁴, and in view of the statement in v.⁸. The Johannine view is, however, perfectly consistent if *ὁ ἐμὸς καιρὸς οὕτω πεπλήρωται* is properly understood. It is noticeable that *καιρός* is used in this chapter, and not *ῥα* (2⁴ etc.). *καιρός* in Greek usage is the right moment for action, especially in the N.T., as that is determined by God (Mt 8²⁹, Mk 1¹⁵). *ῥα* is

practically synonymous, although the tendency in John is to confine it to the hour of Jesus' death. The word is probably used in 2⁴ because the miracle is regarded as inaugurating the public ministry that was to find its climax in the death of Jesus.

We shall have to recur again to the Johannine interpretation of the delays and apparent indecision of Jesus at certain moments (cf. 11⁶ and notes thereupon). R fails to understand the reason for delay. According to J it is due to loyalty on the part of Jesus to the will of God, as interpreted by Him. He will not meet death, at the hands of the authorities in Jerusalem, until the moment is decreed by the Father (cf. 7¹). To R the delay is due to a desire to avoid a public manifestation and reception as Messiah. He went up *οὐ φανερώς ἀλλὰ ὡς ἐν κρυπτῷ*. Yet the public nature of His appearance in the Temple in the middle of the Feast is unmistakable (v.¹⁴). The delay of a day or two in Galilee is in order that Jesus may ascertain whether it is the will of the Father that He should put Himself in the position of danger involved in going up to Jerusalem, where a hostile reception awaited Him. The Divine Will is made plain, and Jesus goes. The prevailing Johannine view is of the complete publicity of the life and teaching of Jesus (cf. 7^{26, 28} 18²⁰). What is 'hidden' is the nature and person of Jesus, from those who do not believe. It is true that in vv.^{3, 4} the brethren seem to take up the same position as is presupposed in R. They demand a fuller acceptance of popularity, and regard His hesitation as inconsistent with complete confidence in His claims (*ζητεῖ αὐτὸς ἐν παρρησίᾳ εἶναι*).

This is also necessary if the enthusiasm of His disciples is not to grow cold (Holtzmann, *Hand-Kommentar zum N.T.*, in loco). They hint that He is not sure of His claims. This argument, however, is met by an explanation that Jesus will not take the step that may end in hatred doing its worst upon Him (v.7), except at the divinely appointed time, and under divine guidance (v.8).

2. Under grammatical points we may note the peculiar use of αὐτός (see under 4¹⁻³ (4) and φανερώς, which is not found elsewhere in the Johannine writings, and only in Mk 1⁴⁵ of the public appearance of Jesus. The verb is used in this sense in 7⁴.

10⁴⁰⁻⁴². The reasons for ascribing this passage to R are mainly grammatical.

There is also the additional reason that the locality from which Jesus has set out, in obedience to the summons from Bethany, has to be defined. The journey must occupy some days if Lazarus is to be already four days in the tomb.

We may note (1) τὸ πρῶτον used in the sense of 'formerly,' and referring back to a previous incident (1²⁸ or 3²⁸); cf. 19³⁹. In 12¹⁶ it means 'at first.'

- (2) πάλιν = 'back' in a local sense; cf. 4³ 4⁴⁶ 6¹⁵. Elsewhere it is used only in the temporal sense of 'again.'
- (3) ἔμεινεν. WH read ἔμεινεν. Elsewhere only the Aorist is used.
- (4) ἐκεῖ, not only at the end of the sentence, but at the end of a section is unusual, except for special emphasis; cf. 11^{31.8}.

Contributions and Comments.

John xii. 47, 48.

MOST of the commentaries to which I have access treat the section to which these verses belong as a summary, in quite colourless commonplace, of the teaching that has gone before. But the verses in question are rather paradox than commonplace in the light of much that has been said. 'If any man hear my sayings, and keep them not, I judge him not: for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my sayings, hath one that judgeth him; the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day.' Set alongside other sayings on the same subject, these words illustrate Matthew Arnold's thesis that the Bible has the varied and flexible utterance of literature, not the iron rigidity of dogma. It speaks from different points of view. It is not afraid to contradict itself or to seem to do so. St. James puts things in his way, St. Paul in his. Even in the same book, contradictory or complementary sayings are put down side by side. A simple example is in Pr 26^{4.5},

'Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou also be like unto him. Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit.' The application, whether of the one or the other, is left to the common sense of disciples, to their *savoir faire*. But the rabbis hesitated in consequence to receive the book into the canon, and soothed their liking for more definite teaching by an interpretation that misses the point.¹ It might be a good thing if this feature of the Bible were brought home to the average reader. Text-books of Scripture bring together congruent quotations. It might be good occasionally to vary the method and put side by side verses that express varying aspects of truth.

It is abundantly said in the New Testament that Jesus is and will be the Judge of men. 'We must all be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ' (2 Co 5¹⁰). The Synoptic Gospels have the vivid image of a great Assize, when Jesus will judge men before God and the angels. 'He shall separate them one from

¹ C. H. Toy's *Proverbs*, p. 473.

another, as a shepherd divideth the sheep from the goats' (Mt 25³²). The Fourth Gospel conceives judgment as part of Christ's work. God has given it to Him. 'The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son' (Jn 5²²). 'The Father hath given the Son authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of man (or a son of man)' (Jn 5²⁷). And this judgment is not merely thought of as in the future, it 'is inevitable in the present. 'For judgment I am come into this world, that they which see not might see; and that they which see might be made blind' (Jn 9³⁹).

But the verses under discussion (Jn 12^{47, 48}) put all this aside. Jesus is not Judge, but Saviour. To emphasize the Saviourhood, v.⁴⁷ denies, in the vigorous Oriental way, that He is Judge. And v.⁴⁸ does not reduce this to commonplace, as some commentators do, by saying, 'Jesus does not judge now, but He will judge men in the last day.' It is careful not to say that. It says something deeper and more suggestive than that. The 'one that judgeth' the disobedient in the last day is still not Jesus but 'the word that I have spoken.' 'The last day' is here, for one cannot follow Wendt in his facile excision of the phrase, but here is nothing of a great dramatic assize. Judgment is not personal but automatic, and acts itself out in the sinner's soul and by the sinner's soul. That soul has passed into a world where the flesh and things seen are no more. Heaven and earth have passed away, but Christ's words have not passed away. They are felt to be the very atmosphere of the new life, and the soul that has despised or has not heeded them is stifled by them. The word awakes in memory and wields the lash of the furies. 'Son, remember.' Psychologists say that the subconscious mind forgets nothing. The rejected word comes back with its 'I told you so,' inspired not by censoriousness or vanity, but by a faithful reflexion of reality.

DAVID CONNOR.

Bewcastle Manse.

The Eschatology of Christ.

MAY I be allowed to take occasion from your December introductory remarks on the very diffi-

cult subject of the eschatological teaching of Christ to mention one objection to the current attribution to Him of the assertion that the Parousia was to come in the lifetime of persons then living; an objection which has, I think, not hitherto been duly considered? It is—with reverence I use the term, dealing as it does with the working of the mind of Jesus—a psychological one. The question is, How could Jesus entertain two ideas at the same time, one of which conflicted with the other? For, if any credibility is to be given to the narratives of the Synoptic tradition, two tremendous catastrophic events were proclaimed by Him; one, the ruin of Jerusalem and Judaism; the other, the final condemnation of all things by the Parousia. But if they are made simultaneous, one, the greater one, must by its weight supersede and exclude the other. Can it be conceived, then, that He spoke of them as simultaneous, as both occurring within the current generation? If He really believed and inculcated the certainty of an immediate Parousia—an event in which all lesser events would be utterly submerged—how could He, as the Gospel teaches He did, dwell frequently with compassion and with warning on the other coming event, the judgment of Jerusalem, which, however important in itself, could not but in comparison with the other mundane and final one, sink into insignificance? Would it not be but playing with words to dwell with sad and earnest warnings upon the local and lesser events? Surely the fact must be that while He spoke of the one as imminent, He only regarded the other as lying in the background, certain to come to pass but at an unforeseen and maybe distant epoch? Much of His teaching, we know, was misunderstood and misinterpreted by those around Him, partly, no doubt, by the influence on their minds of the prevailing traditional beliefs. May it not have happened thus in regard to the matter in question? No doubt He looked for a final, world-wide judgment, but there is good reason to believe that His knowledge in regard to it was limited, and His language about it was, unavoidably therefore perhaps, couched in the traditional phraseology common to Himself with those around Him; and it is not difficult to imagine that those around Him would interpret His sayings in accordance with

their own expectations. There will therefore have been some confusion in their reports. But the two events must have been differently regarded by Him; the one, clear and imminent; the other, in the haze of an unknown future. Even if He saw

the greater one foreshortened in distance and expected it soon to occur, that is a different thing from making an absolute assertion at its immediate imminence.

C. H. PAREZ.

Hollywood, Haywards Heath.

Entre Nous.

Oxford Poets.

A small volume of *Oxford Poetry, 1915*, has been published by Mr. Blackwell (1s. net). It is small, but there are no fewer than twenty-five poets represented in it. The poems are arranged in the alphabetical order of the authors' names, which yields much variety and some surprises. It seems to warn us not to speak of a school of Oxford poetry at present. The most prominent fact is individuality, not similarity. And that fact makes it quite impossible to take one poem as example of the whole. Mr. T. W. Earp has six poems in the book, and we shall quote one of the six, but it represents Mr. Earp and no one else.

ECSTASY.

Years longer than years go by in bleak enduring.
We bustle over humdrum,
toil at some littleness,

when suddenly a flame leaps up within us.

Those things sense knew are whirled away,
expunged,
and sight itself is blinded by the dazzle,
the blaze of glory.

Briefly then we live
till the dropped curtain.

May you have hours where I have had but
moments!

George Abel.

In the very happy 'Foreword' which Professor Stalker has written for Mr. Abel's volume of poems in the dialect of Aberdeenshire, entitled *Wylins fae my Wallet* (Gardner; 2s. 6d. net), he says that though not having the honour to be an Aberdonian,

he can read them without difficulty. And yet they are the purest Aberdeenshire. There is not a word misused or misspelt. But Mr. Abel has never run after odd and out-of-the-way words simply because they are picturesque, a temptation to which even Mr. Murray of 'Hamewith' is occasionally a victim. He writes in character without extravagance or disguise. Here is a plea for

HUMOUR.

O dinna think it wrang to lauch,
To see the fun o' things,
For mirth, it is a medicine
To peer fowk an' to kings.

They say that far abeen the lift
The fires o' humour play,
That God Himsel' raxed doon some quiles
To cheer oor mortal day.

I hear the thunner's lood guffa,
That gars the rafters dirl,
I watch the aul' wind's idelty,
When oot upo' the birl.

The wee roy't kittlins on the hearth,
The lammies on the lea,
The doggies at their tackie games,
The monkeys on the tree—

Far can the craturs get it a'?
Heaven's aumrie gies 't, I think:
War we but gleg I'm sure we'd see
The vera wirmies wink.

But fawvour't man has mair than a'
O' humour in his e'e;
The beasts, they get a gowpenfu';
An oxterfu' has he.

He needs it, for there's mony whisks
 An' scaums abeen the sod;
 He needs it, as the tourin' lum
 Maun hae its lichtnin'-rod.

There's mony freenships wid be smash't,
 An' mony joys tak' wings,
 But for the licht by which we see
 The fun o' fowk an' things.

So we will gie oor thanks an eke,
 For sel's an' for the race,
 An' pray that Gweed sen' doon galore
 Kind humour's savin' grace.

Dorothy Francis Gurney.

A Little Book of Quiet (Newnes; 2s. 6d. net) is an appropriate title for Mrs. Gurney's new volume. Every piece in it is a poem and every poem is of quiet. Is there to be no purpose in art? Art for art's sake? In this little work of art there is deliberate purpose. Mrs. Gurney writes and says: 'Come thou too into the place of quiet, into the heart of silence, where God is.' We may choose anywhere. Take this:

WHEN I SHALL PASS, O! GOD.

When I shall pass, O! God,
 Out of this mortal path
 I shall not fear Thy chastening rod
 Nor Thy most righteous wrath.

These have I known below,
 Have known and learned to bless—
 I fear the influences that flow
 From Thy white holiness.

Yet in my Saviour's name
 Grant me, O! God, to prove
 Thy awful holiness the same
 As Thy undying love!

Mary E. Boyle.

Anatole France has a fancy that when some one asked Pilate in his later life about the trial of Jesus, he had utterly forgotten it and Him. Mary E. Boyle would have Pilate haunted all his days by the memory of Jesus. *Pilate in Exile at Vienne*

is his soliloquy (Heffer; 1s. net). And he is troubled.

Ah! Son of God, what in thee is divine?
 Is it this silence, when my very soul
 Desires some word to comfort and to guide?
 Is it divine to stand apart and gaze?
 To suffer persecution to oneself
 And say no word which might uplift the crowd

Of those who suffer not for hours, but years?
 Say thou art crucified? For three short hours
 Thou wilt be tortured. What of the lives
 Born without hope, and living without hope?
 Praying, not for relief, but to endure.
 Half-strangled at the thought of future ills,
 Whilst horror of the past kills memory.
 Is a god powerless before the mob?
 Is god then in each helpless criminal?
 'He made himself a god'; the people cry.
 Divinity! does it mean sacrifice?

Darrell Figgis.

The best poems in *The Mount of Transfiguration* (Maunsell; 3s. 6d. net) are purely Irish. Their general title is 'Songs of Acaill.' We shall quote one of them, of the rest the short dramatic piece at the end has moved us most. It is as Irish as anything in the book; its tragedy is Irish, unredeemable tragedy after every effort at redemption. The poem we wish to quote is very short. It might serve as exposition of Mt 5²², 'I say unto you.'

MIONNÁN.

In a stern world of wisdom and command,
 That has no man enticed,
 Among these gaunt wise hills, and these
 Strong cliffs and sundering seas,
 Suddenly in a light I understand
 The wonder-words of the Christ:
 And Joy quickens its flight through endless
 Beauty,
 And Beauty wins through a Love higher than
 Duty.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,
 and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,
 Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.